78-2
19

LIBRARY
OF THE
THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY,
AT
PRINCETON, N. J.

DONATION OF
SAMUEL AGNEW,
OF PHILADELPHIA, PA.

Letter ..... March 15th 1855.
No. 1

BX 1784 .M322 1829
MacDonald, W. R. 1787-1854.
Christianity, Protestantism
and popery, compared and

Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2024 with funding from
Princeton Theological Seminary Library

https://archive.org/details/christianityprot00macd

PROCESSION of the INQUISITION at GOA.

CHRISTIANITY,

PROTESTANTISM, AND POPERY,

COMPARED AND CONTRASTED;

IN WHICH IS SHOWN THE

WHOLE DOCTRINE OF THE ROMISH CHURCH,

AS TAUGHT AT THE PRESENT DAY:

ALSO,

THE ORIGIN OF EVERY INVENTION OF THAT CHURCH WHICH POPERY HAS INTRODUCED,

AND THE MEANS EMPLOYED AT THE REFORMATION TO ESTABLISH

THE

PROTESTANT RELIGION

ON THE FIRM BASIS OF

PRIMITIVE CHRISTIANITY.

William Russell MacDonald

"The true Church of Christ appeals to the UNDERSTANDING:—the *Atheist* may be converted to its faith; but the *Bigot*, who has been taught to erect his hopes of salvation on the basis of Superstition—who has been taught to surrender the most exalted attribute of his nature, REASON, at the feet of Idolatry,—such a one dare not listen to the internal workings of CONVICTION, since, conscious of the victory, he shrinks affrighted at her power, and turns to the Priest who had misled him, a sincere penitent, for having, but an instant, yielded up the reins of prejudice to common sense."—P. 57.

LONDON:

SAMUEL MAUNDER, 10, NEWGATE STREET.

MDCCCXXIX.

LONDON:
PRINTED BY WILLIAM CLOWES,
Stamford-street.

DEDICATION.

TO THE

REFORMED AND ROMISH CLERGY AND LAITY

OF THE

UNITED KINGDOM OF GREAT BRITAIN AND IRELAND

THIS WORK IS INSCRIBED,

IN THE HOPE

First, that the Protestant Minister of Christ may not deem it unuseful in assisting him to point out the *very material difference* between the unerring doctrines he inculcates, as taught by our Saviour himself, and those pernicious tenets introduced by erring man, by which their simplicity is obscured—their sublimity reduced to external shew.

Secondly, to the Protestant Layman this volume is offered, as a sure Guide to him in judging between the Reformed and Romish professions of faith,—and which, by shewing him the doctrines of the Church of Rome, precisely in her own language, contrasted with the Holy Scriptures from which he has been taught his Christian belief, will confirm and strengthen him in the right way.

Thirdly, to the Romish Priest these pages are presented; and, as they will show him when, by whom, and for what purposes the inventions of his Church first disfigured Christianity, it is presumed that, in some instances, at least, the prejudices of education will give way to conviction; and that the paltry quibblings of sophistry may be sacrificed to the Christian spirit of Truth.

Lastly,—although the writer's chief object—the ROMAN CATHOLIC LAITY are earnestly solicited to read this work: since it contains the "Grounds of the Faith" entire, in which they profess to believe, but which a comparative few only have read—other books being generally put into the hands of British Romanists. The opportunity of making themselves acquainted with the *whole* of what their Church claims the right of demanding of them (although in a Protestant kingdom many of these claims are never *enforced*) is herein afforded; whilst to the above are *added* such portions of Scripture as the Pope merely *refers* to; by which extracts, fully and fairly quoted, it will appear evident that the "faith" they have been taught is far removed from the faith preached by OUR SAVIOUR.

As the work is designed to induce the Romanist to peruse the commands of GOD, whilst no *Christian* can impugn the motive, it is hoped that no *unchristian* spirit will possess sufficient influence to frustrate so desirable an end.

Besides the whole Romish faith, the Scriptures to which that faith is contrasted, and the Protestant tenets with which they are compared, the following sheets contain the "Rational Inducements to joining Communion with the Church of Rome," in the words of Dr. Challoner, a Roman Catholic Bishop; also "Rational Inducements to joining Communion with the Protestant Reformed Church," by M. Lefevre, a convert to her faith in 1825.

In short, an impartial examination of TRUTH ONLY is courted; nor can any Religion be pure, the professors of which shrink from such a test. That all those for whom this work is designed may think so, is the sincere wish of

THE AUTHOR.

13*th November*, 1828.

CONTENTS.

Page

PREFACE xi

INTRODUCTION 1

An elucidation of TRUTH, the object of the work. Early impressions, and a restraint of the progress of intellect, the strength of Popery. Papists invited to disprove the assertion (if they can do so), and to examine the facts stated as proved by the Scriptures. Characters of Protestant and Popish clergymen, as resulting from a strict adherence to their respective doctrines. Jesuits: origin and object of their Order. Indelicacy of Popish books.

"GROUNDS OF FAITH," &c. EXTRACT FROM THE CREED OF ATHANASIUS 13-14

The Romish Church erroneously impresses upon the belief of her adherents that she is the only *Catholic* Church. Of the Athanasian Creed.

"A PROFESSION OF CATHOLIC FAITH," &c. 16

Declaration of Romish Bishops.

THE GROUNDS OF THE CATHOLIC DOCTRINE AS CONTAINED IN THE PROFESSION OF FAITH OF PIUS IV.

CHAPTER I.—OF THE CHURCH.

SECT. I.—THAT CHRIST HAS ALWAYS A TRUE CHURCH UPON EARTH 19

Who are the members of whom it is composed, as declared by the Scriptures. The Apostles' Creed not declaratory of the faith prescribed by the Romish, but by the Protestant Church.

SECT. II. THAT CHRIST'S [*meaning the Popish*] CHURCH UPON EARTH IS ALWAYS ONE 25

Unity of the CHRISTIAN Catholic Church broken by Popery. Her Doctrines pernicious—*Examples*. Popish perversions of, and Protestant appeals to, the Scriptures. Blasphemy of the Papal Class Books.

SECT. III.—THAT THE CHURCH OF CHRIST IS ALWAYS HOLY IN HER DOCTRINES, AND ALWAYS FREE FROM PERNICIOUS ERRORS 34

Additions of Popery to the doctrines of Christ. What *degree* of faith necessary for *good* Papists to profess, as extracted from

CHAPTER VI.

Page

Of the Mass 132

Easy method prescribed by Popery for cleansing her followers of sin. Mass, whence derived, and not to be found in the Scriptures: first instituted, when, and by whom. Protestants receive the *spiritual* gifts of their Saviour's sacrifice. Popish references to *unwritten Scripture*. The ceremony of the Mass opposed to the Doctrine of Christ. Administration of the Lord's Supper in the first ages of Christianity, similar to the Protestant Rite of the present day. Solitary Masses. Papal *advantages* of performing the service of a Church in an unknown tongue, exemplified. Origin of this unscriptural practice.

CHAPTER VII.

Of Purgatory 144

Protestants pray for the dead. Witticism of the late Father O'Leary. Purgatory invented for purifying Papists of *venial* sins. Of the "Great Honour" due to Priests. St. Paul's prediction verified in Popish executions of their fellow beings. Petrarch's prayer for the return of civil monsters to free the land from the curse of Popery. Character of Cyprian. Jewish Sects. The Sacrament of the Lord's Supper denied by Popery to those who listen to the doctrines of Christ preached by a Protestant clergyman. Limbo, a place of *rest* for Popish Saints in Hell. Apocryphal Books of the Old Testament not received into the Jewish Canon. Jerome's opinion of them. Origin of Purgatory.

CHAPTER VIII.

Of the Veneration and Invocation of Saints . . . 156

Pagan and Papal deities of similar creation. Popery *instils* the breach of the third commandment. Papists taught to call ten times upon the Virgin Mary, and once upon their Maker. False quotations of the Pope. Origin of Popish Saint-making. The rosary and crown introduced, and *divine honour* paid to the Virgin Mary. Of the *Index Expurgatorius*. Papal Saints assigned to peculiar provinces—from parish patrons to the care of pigs.

Sect. II.—That the Saints and Angels pray to God for us 166

Going to Mass no surety that Angels pray for Papists. The Pope's definition of charity in heaven, with a hint how he might have employed himself in showing *his own* charity on earth. Persecution of Martyrs. Addison's Syllogisms in Papal Logic. Saints in heaven ignorant of our state on earth. God and Mammon.

Page

Sect. III.—Of the Invocation of Saints 172

Popery well provided with the Saints of her own making. Wherein the difference in the rule of faith between Protestants and Papists. Saints rejoice over repentant sinners, and (as the Scriptures inform us) *when*. Protestants do not invoke their intercession, and why. Jacob sought the blessing of God. St. John's prediction of Antichrist.

Of Relics 178

Diffidence of the Pope in speaking of Relics and Miracles. Early Hermits. Origin of Monkery. The Cross first worshipped, when and by whom, and consequent impostures of the Romish Priests. Frauds practised upon Relic-hunters. Of Miracles in general—Dr. Milner's Miracles, &c. Heresy of Mr. Charles Butler. An admonitory hint to Romanists. More Miracles. Of Francis, Dominic, and the *Tutelars* of France, Spain, &c. Of the Legends of Montferrat, Loretto, and of a Miracle *not* contained in the Legends. The venerable Bede. Papists have no right to reject *any* of their own miracles whilst they believe in others proceeding from the same source:—of those performed by Priests Murphy and Roche—Miraculous cure of Winifred White—Miracles at a stand-still in Rome when the Pope was imprisoned by Bonaparte.

CHAPTER IX.

Of Images 195

Images addressed in prayer, and worshipped—The Brazen Serpent. Illustration of the "relative honour" of Popery. Origin of Image-worship. Of talking Crucifixes, and Father Crasset's opinion of Images in general.

CHAPTER X.

Of Indulgences 203

Running accounts of Crime opened between the Popish Clergy and Laity. Indulgences for sin according to price—Murder cheaper than a denial of the Pope's supremacy—Examples. The keys of Heaven, when, and to whom given by our Saviour. Falsehood of the Pope in asserting that St. Paul had granted an Indulgence. Origin of Indulgences. Extract from the Bull of Leo XII., 1825-6.

CHAPTER XI.

Of the Supremacy of St. Peter and his Successors . . . 210

Supremacy of the Apostles forbidden by our Saviour, and denied by St. Peter himself. The Doctrines of Christ and those of Popery summarily contrasted. Of the *Bulla in Cœna Domini*, and Extracts of the original—Popes declared Governors of the

Page

World upon their Coronation. Of their forged Decretals. Origin of Sanctuary, Saint-making, and changing their names.

CONCLUSION 224

Every Christian commanded to prove his own work. Of Papal Jurisprudence.

APPENDIX 227

Dr. Challoner's "Rational Inducements" to Popery. Vincent of Lerins—Luther—Henry VIII.—Queen Elizabeth—Philip II. of Spain—The Doctor's historical inaccuracy: his *political* doctrines, under the guise of *religion*, unjustifiable. The Reformation restored to Britain its ancient independence. William I. denied the authority of the Pope. William II.—Henry I. The evils, as stated by Dr. Challoner attendant on Protestantism. Erasmus: his sentiments of Luther and of the Reformation. Dangerous admissions of Mr. Charles Butler. How Popish Priests seek to catch dying men, and why. "Holy Solitaries"—female duties in, and out, of a Cloister. Antiquity of Error no excuse for its continuance. Protestants' treatment of "*heretics*." The practice of Christ's Precepts *only* necessary to Salvation. Of Popish Unity.

RATIONAL INDUCEMENTS TO ROMANISTS TO JOIN THE PROTESTANT REFORMED CHURCH, by a French Convert, in 1825.

ERRATA.

Throughout the running head, *after* and, *read* Roman.

P.	L.
3	26, *for* those, *read* these.
5	3, *read* Christian Catholic, *dele* hyphen.
6	13, *for* the restraint, *read* a restraint.
7	25, *for* depends, *read* depend.
24	9, *for* whence, *read* which.
—	3, (from foot of the page) *for* judge from Popish extracts from the Scriptures, *read* judge by Popish extracts of the Scriptures.
35	1, (of text) *read*, it may be presumed this section is—*dele* to understand the meaning of; and "it," second word of second line.
53	1, *for* Rome, *read* Romish Church.
64	7, *for* it has, *read* she has.
72	10, *read* Note on Luke.
—	17, *read* Note on John.
—	1, (of note), *after* the 17th of March, *read* 1826.
85	1, (of note), *for* men who, *read* Protestants.
112	16, *after* without, *read* making.
—	17, *after* Scriptures, *read* themselves.
123	11, *after* consecrated, *insert*).
—	17, *for* Pascasius, *read* Paschasius.
160	20, *for* days of their obligation, *read* their days of obligation.
161	16, *dele* and.
168	18, *after* means, *read* of.
169	7, *for* soul's, *read* souls'.
177	15, *dele* not.
178	15, *for* has, *read* have.
182	(note ‡), *for* Exceptiones Legales, read *Exceptions Legales*.
185	20, *for* favourable, *read* favoured.
190	5, *for* Monserrat, *read* Montferrat.
—	20, *after* about, *read* in.
—	2, (of note), *for* know, *read* knew.
203	13, *for* defects, *read* effects.
216	6, (from foot), *for* his, *read* this.
233	6, (of note *), *for* those, *read* individuals.
237	1, (of note). *for* The somewhat, *read* These somewhat.
239	3, *for* set, *read* sat.

PREFACE.

—Prefaces are passed over by thousands, unread, although every reader looks *for*, if not *at*, a Preface. We trust, however, the one we have just commenced will meet with a more favourable reception, since we have sat down deliberately to state a few general remarks on the subject treated of; and also on the abuse which we feel, *by anticipation*, will be cast by a particular party upon this, our humble offering, at the shrine of Common Sense. Perhaps this hint may not be thrown away upon the party alluded to—we hope it will not; and, to add to its weight, we beg to remind them that mere abuse in the present case will be unavailing, unless they can first *prove by the Scriptures* that *Popery is* the doctrine of Christ. We have, throughout the present work, denied it; and if our assertions be not fully borne out by the copious extracts of Holy Writ which we have adduced, it will be no difficult matter for the Romish clergy to show the *misapplication* of them.

In the present age of liberality it is impossible —at least, we have found it so—to open a Popish book which teems not with a most liberal portion of condemnatory asseverations against all Protestants, who must, they are assured, be damned in the next

world, and who are in the same sentence, perhaps, gravely complained of, for their "heretical prejudices" against the *Religion* that has denounced them.—Popery is ever "up in arms" when the terms "bigotry" and "superstition" are applied by any writer to the most bigoted and superstitious, save and except only when urged by those of her own communion; who, at least, when addressing themselves to *Roman* Catholics, bestow a general sprinkling of these and similar expressions throughout their pages upon all who dissent from her.

If there be any persons who really *are* superstitious and bigoted—since we never knew any who so acknowledged themselves—it is such only, we presume, of whom we can expect to hear of their own "*infallibility*;" none that we ever read or heard of who are not chargeable with these prejudices either think or profess themselves *to be* "infallible."

Bigotry and superstition, then, be the epithets used by whom they may, can only *apply* to the superstitious and the bigoted; and, if the tenets of the Romish Church be not calculated to engender them, the extreme *folly* of those who charge her with false devotion and intolerance must be the more apparent, from its injustice. However, mankind are generally apt to be more tenacious of hearing unpleasant truths of themselves than the most palpable falsehoods. When Protestants aver that the frail basis of Popery *is* "superstition and bigotry," their Romish brethren appear to be more angry than they would be were the former to declare them rank *Atheists*; when Papists tax the Protestant

Church with these vices, the latter smiles at the *inconsistency* of the charge.

In the course of the following pages, we have applied these terms where as we think, the subject strictly warrants our doing so—not in the way of retaliation, but simply because we knew of no others in which more clearly to express what we really meant. If we have used them *unjustly*, we know and will chance the consequences; but still think we have nothing to apprehend on this score, although we cannot, with Dr. Milner, pronounce the "Admonition" of Dr. Porteus to be "*empty declamation*," merely "calculated for the *stupid* and the *bigoted*," which concludes thus: "Let others build on Fathers and Popes, on traditions and councils, what they will: let us continue firm, as we are, on the foundation of the Apostles and Prophets, JESUS CHRIST himself being the chief corner-stone."—(Ephes. ii.)

The chief object of the following sheets is to induce such Romanists, as may peruse them, to attentively READ THE SCRIPURES, as we have repeatedly urged them to do throughout our comments; and, surely, if the Papal Church be the "true and only Church of Christ," as her Priests assert, the *only authentic History of* CHRIST'S DOCTRINES and ACTS must confirm them in their present faith? Protestants are never afraid that the WORD of GOD will induce Christians to turn to Paganism;—by their circulation of it they daily witness its effects in turning the Unbeliever to Christianity:—the Church of Rome denounces Protestants as more "invincible heretics" than Pagans

(having an *opportunity* of joining communion with her which they reject)—and *why*, therefore, *ought* she to *fear* that by reading the Scriptures her flock would forsake her, *unlesss he feel conscious that her doctrines are erroneous?* Who, of her *British* followers, will *say*, if he were satisfied that they were so, he would still hold communion with her? Of this fact the Romish clergy are too well aware to permit them to read the Gospel of Christ, whilst their "Church" declares, as Dr. Milner has it, "*the whole business of the Scriptures belongs to herself.*"

In speaking of Roman Catholic writers of the present age, we name those whom we deem the greatest *English* bulwarks of Popery, as the late Dr. Milner, Mr. Charles Butler, &c. But as we always do this in commenting upon their own writings, which we quote, unless it be shown that their statements do not warrant our remarks, we deem no apology necessary either to the living or to the memory of the dead. With the political writings and orations of the Roman *clerical* politicians we have made it a point not to interfere.

We trust that our readers, whether of the Reformed or Romish Church, will do us the justice of acknowledging we are not of the description of "bigots" so bitterly complained of by Dr. Milner, when he says, that Protestant writers "*dress up a* HIDEOUS FIGURE, *composed of their own misrepresentations*, or else of those *undefined opinions*, and *unauthorized practices*, which *they call* POPERY, and then amuse their readers or hearers with *exposing the enormity* of it, and pulling it to pieces!"

We submit that the "Hideous Figure," the "*deformity*" of which we have, in the ensuing pages, held up to the public gaze, appears as she has "dressed up" *herself?* To any person possessing the least degree of candour, it must be evident that we have put forward no "*undefined opinions*" of "*unauthorized practices*" for the purpose of "amusing our readers;" but that, on the contrary, we have exhibited "POPERY," such as she declares herself to be—precisely in her own words, to the very letter. Neither do we think this public and strictly correct exhibition of her in the least calculated to "amuse" our Protestant readers, however it may disgust them. The origin of all the *new* and superstitious points of Popish faith, adduced from the very best authorities we could procure, may, indeed, cause a smile of *contempt* at the *motives* which have led interested and ambitious men to force them upon the ignorant as *essentials to salvation;* yet, not, we should hope, unmingled with pity, that the darkness of those ages—when, as Baronius says, it seemed as though Christ had slept in the ship of his Church—should have favoured the introduction of the gross impieties which, from the first existence of Popery to the very hour in which we write these observations, have disfigured, and still continue to disfigure, the pure religion of JESUS CHRIST;—which have turned the best feelings of the heart to the most debasing and implacable hatred, and have exchanged the tears of charity to drops of blood. This "Hideous Figure," which has called forth all the evil passions of humanity into action throughout the whole Christian world, will,

doubtless, dwindle on for some time longer in the sickly condition to which her own impurities have reduced her, however Falsehood may endeavour to disguise her monstrosities.

A thorough "Reformation" in religion and morals can only be accomplished by striking at the *root* of the evil to be subdued; and that the blow *has* been struck with a well-directed aim, look *now* at England, and as history shows her to have been, when, crushed by clerical intolerance, her vigorous powers lay prostrate in the dust, enslaved by the galling manacle of MIND, forged by the foreign despot of the Vatican!—Look *now,* we say, at England, where every individual may freely breathe his conscious aspirations to his GOD, after that form which is most consonant to his own feelings, and where the noblest CONSTITUTION upon earth is so deeply imbued with the spirit of Justice and Christian Charity towards all mankind, that he who basks in the radiant beams of its protection fears not those dark clouds, which enshroud the "Hideous Figure" that would annihilate him, should burst upon his head:—no, those only apprehend the evil consequences of this "Figure," whose subserviency of mind has been cherished by its agents whilst they led them to worship it; and who are, even now, exerting themselves, to the very uttermost, to increase the number of its blind adorers. Popery has been taught to know, by dear-bought experience, that "knowledge is power;" and hence it is that her most favoured agents are unremitting in their efforts to withhold and to subdue the power of knowledge. But in

vain is the dark attempt:—the labourer who can read a newspaper, scoffs at her denunciations, though embellished by the wood-engraver with "*faithful*" illustrations of the "Torments of Hell" for those who laugh at or oppose her *.

When we commenced the *Introduction* to our subject, we determined to adhere to it as closely as possible, and to avoid every expression that might *fairly* be deemed unjustifiable, or that *ought* to be considered offensive by any advocates of the cause of TRUTH; but that those should think so to whose "Profession of Faith" we are opposed, is beyond our hope, although we have not stated, knowingly, one single circumstance throughout our comments upon the "*authorized practices*" of Popery, which TRUTH would bid us disavow.

We now more particularly address ourselves to our fellow-Protestants, and simply ask if, amidst the daily calumnies which assail their Church—or, more

* Speaking of these edifying compositions, *The Times* (Dec. 1825) says, "It appears that body (the Roman Catholics) are active in distributing Tracts in support of their faith; in truth, we have met with such. But could they not offer a pretty little relic of some kind or other, of which the religion of our forefathers had such abundance, along with the Tracts?—a nail out of the real cross, a thorn out of the crown? Or even a crucifix would be a handy thing, or a little image like a tobacco-stopper, of the Goddess whom they worship, the Queen of Heaven, with the bambino in her arms; which objects of idolatry are in all their churches, where there are no Protestants to turn them into deserved ridicule. Above all, why cannot they compass a miracle or two? The religion of our forefathers could work you a miracle or two every day; and Popery, they tell us, never alters. Miracles, also, are incessantly performed at Rome to convince the faithful who have no need to be convinced. We treat this subject with mockery, because we think it the best way of putting an end to the foolish stir which the Papists are making in support of the religion of our forefathers."—The just remark with which the sentence concludes, as it is political, we decline quoting. We could refer to the *Herald, Chronicle, Post, Courier, Globe,* in short, every respectable London Journal, for similar opinions of the *purity* of Popery, however different their politics.

properly speaking, the religion of Christ, in which they have been taught to believe—if, whilst it is every day averred that their tenets, drawn from that unpolluted source THE WORD OF GOD HIMSELF, are "heretical," "illiberal," "intolerant," &c. &c. &c.—have *Protestants*, we ask, no *duty* to perform toward the Church of which they are members, and to society in general? Are the inflammatory declamations against those Institutions which Protestants hold most sacred, to be tacitly considered as mere Papal figures of rhetoric, and their recorded falsehoods to be disseminated without a contradiction, lest it be deemed illiberal to refute and expose them? If there be those in this enlightened age who affect such superlatively-refined notions of liberality as thus to sacrifice TRUTH AND THE EVIDENCE OF THEIR OWN SENSES to the prejudices of an implacable hierarchy which has already condemned them (with all its *power* of doing so—to *eternal perdition!*) —we must confess that our own humble ideas are of a more comprehensible stamp; and whilst we regard all mankind as our brethren, we are not inclined to give up our birthright—THE PLAIN USE OF OUR REASON—merely because some fanatical foreigner may choose to declare we cannot appreciate its value, nor profit by its exertion.

To ourselves, who have, with some patience and attention, compared Primitive Christianity with Protestantism, and contrasted it with Popery, it would appear somewhat strange that the sheer abuse which is every day "levelled at heretics" should be deemed by the enlightened and liberal as the mere vituperation of *ignorance*, did we not know that thousands of

honest men cannot imagine but that gentlemen of the Romish Church speak the truth when they affect to deplore these attacks. We say, *affect* to regret them, because, *if* the practice were *objectionable* to the learned and most influential of that body, IT WOULD, AT ONCE, CEASE.

The Christian faith, as professed by Protestants, is as open to comment as the profession of the Romish Church; and if it can be *proved* contrary to the doctrines of its Divine Founder, let the Popish clergy *fairly* exhibit the *whole* of it, and the Scriptures (if they can find them) to which it is opposed. It is not *insisting* that the tenets of Protestantism are "*pestiferous*," &c. that is calculated to *convince* a reflecting man; and this leads us to think that *quantity* rather than *quality* is the great object of Papal conversion—more of Papist, if less of Christian.

For our own parts, the only difference we perceive in the writings of the *liberal* and the learned—the ridiculous and the vulgarly ignorant of Romish authors, is in the style and language of their works—whether it be in the theological compositions of Mr. Charles Butler, Bishops Milner, Poynter, Doyle, &c., or the disgusting trash of the most humble order of their tract-writers:—still, we say, they all breathe the same immutable *spirit of Popery*. How *can* it be otherwise when they ALL (see p. 17) "*promise true obedience to the Bishop of Rome*"—when they ALL "*profess* ALL *other things*" the Church of Rome commands; and when they ALL "*condemn, reject*, and *anathematize*" ALL that she deems inimical to her temporal and secular interests?

It may, in conclusion, be observed that, had we felt it necessary to do so, we could have filled our pages with quotations from the "ancient fathers," in proof of their opposition to the inventions of Popery, which she has, at her own peril, introduced into the Romish Church as *essentials to salvation.* But we rely upon the SCRIPTURES ALONE as our best authority for the refutation of these; and, as we think we have extracted sufficiently from *Papal* authorities to corroborate every assertion we have made, we deemed further references to any secondary source a useless labour, as it would have been equally unprofitable to our readers.

Of the modern authorities, we have chiefly preferred Mosheim; since, independent of his own individual research, he gives us his references to, and accounts of the most respectable ecclesiastical writers, from the Apostolic age down to that in which he lived; and as the very sword-in-hand controversialists of the Romish Church refer to this acknowledged meritorious author, our Popish friends will perhaps credit the authority of our extracts. We have also (as we stated, in our *Introduction*, we intended to do) referred to many writers, some of whose observations are thrown into the text, and, where they are of a general tenor, are unacknowledged.

CHRISTIANITY AND CATHOLICISM CONTRASTED.

"Popery, in its proper colours, is so unlike Christianity, that it is in vain ever to hope to promote it if it appear in its own shape. It is necessary, therefore, that this religion be made to look as orthodox as possible. Some things are denied, others mollified, all disguised; and a double benefit is thereby obtained. Popery is to be received as a very innocent, harmless thing; and the Protestants, especially the ministers and first reformers, are to be represented to the world as a sort of people who have supported themselves by calumny and lies; and made a noise about errors and corruptions, which are nowhere to be found but in their own brains or books, but which the Church of Rome detests as well as we."—Abp. Wake.

"From the several conversations which it has been my chance to have with unbelievers, I have learned that ignorance of the nature of our religion, and a disinclination to study both it and its evidences, are to be reckoned among the chief causes of infidelity."—Beattie's *Evidences*, v. i. p. 6.

"—Men readily believe what they wish, and the Christian religion being opposite to fraudulent dealings in our intercourse with others—to intemperance in the gratification of our own appetites; to all the sins, crimes, and vices which men are prone to, it cannot be a matter of surprise that many profligate—many thoughtless persons, should listen with greediness to whatever tends to free them from its influence."——Bp. Watson's *Apol. for the Bible.*

INTRODUCTION.

NEITHER charitableness, uncharitableness, liberality, nor illiberality, is the object of the writer of these pages—it is TRUTH *alone*—nor shall any other feeling or passion attract him, in his present effort, from the "evenness of her path." As no question of a *mere political tendency* ought to be mixed up with subjects strictly religious, so, in the course of the proposed investigation of scriptural truths, no such question shall deter the writer, on the one hand, from stating self-evident facts, nor, on the other, influence him to withhold them. He is about to compare the "*Grounds of the Roman Catholic Faith*" with the sacred writings upon which it is alleged that faith is grounded; not, indeed, as has been frequently done, by merely extracting *particular passages*, and contrasting them with others, but by giving the WHOLE DOCTRINE *of* POPERY *as it is at present taught*, with its scriptural authorities; and which, although Papists *ought* to be conversant in them, few, comparatively, have taken the trouble to peruse. These shall be given without the addition, subtraction, or interpolation of a single line. In fact, that there may be no error in this respect, the Papal "GROUNDS OF FAITH" shall be composed from the *printed text*, with every distinguishing mark as given by the Roman Catholics themselves. Thus far, it is hoped, the Papist will have no just cause of complaint in being called upon to read *his own tenets;* and the Protestant is requested, also, coolly to examine them, that, by a fair comparison between those and

his own profession and with the scriptures, he may be enabled, dispassionately, to form a just conclusion on the pretensions of each, and thus to confirm his present belief, or to seek "that better way," which the Church of Rome avers to be only found in the paths which lead direct to her own altars. It is presumed that these assertions will not be deemed egotistical, when it is declared, the unerring truths of "HOLY WRIT" shall be quoted—and *fairly* quoted—(not merely a line *here* and *there*, as it will be seen is the case by Popery), to substantiate every fact advanced. The present work not being intended as an appeal to the passions, but to the *evidence of sense*, the plan is as much simplified as the case would admit of. A portion (*cut out from the printed text*) of the Roman Catholic "Faith" will be first given, to which will succeed the quotations from the Scriptures applicable to the subject treated of; and, after these, such remarks, supported by the authority of sacred and profane writers, as may be thought to blend a proper degree of amusement with information, and to elucidate the various and ambiguous mysteries practised by the votaries of Popery.

As it is rare, indeed, that religious examinations and discussions are conducted either with good feeling or good temper, it is hoped that, in this respect at least, the present attempt may differ from those in which such a dereliction of temperate inquiry is evident. The writer has already admitted that he shall fairly avail himself of the best authorities he can procure for his purpose, sacred and profane; but he flatters himself that neither the *Roman* nor any other Catholic will have any fair cause of complaint in consequence of an unjust assertion. His own observations will be distinguished from those of others throughout; and if any party should deem these as extending farther than the occasion of them warrants, those who so consider them are requested, in the same strain of fearless truth, to expose their folly. The terms applied to the two classes of Christians of whom

the writer is about to speak more generally, are Papist and Protestant, for the sake of distinction, since they both profess the Christian-Catholic creed—the Protestant *literally ;* the Papist with such *additions* as his Church has deemed it expedient to introduce.

Papists call Protestants *heretics* for protesting against the doctrines of Popery; yet the latter hesitate not to avow themselves Protestants. Papists acknowledge the Pope (*papa*) to be the head of their church; yet, sometimes, appear to feel angry at this appellation being applied to them. Why they should so feel they only can tell; but, on the present occasion, it is requested that this distinction from their Protestant brethren may not be misunderstood. The writer has stated his reason for it; and, whilst he entreats the unprejudiced not to suppose him capable of using a term of unjust reproach, he will pursue his self-imposed task without deviating from FACT, regardless of the sneers of superstition or the vituperations of bigotry, proceed they from whatsoever source they may.

As enough has already been said to assure the Papist it has proceeded from the pen of one who is a dissentient from popish doctrines, if it be asked *who* it is that thus assumes to judge of those doctrines, sanctioned and practised by the Church of Rome? this is the writer's answer:—"A plain, unlettered man;" yet one who, with the "Sacred Volume" for *his* guide, fears not the strength of the whole Papal Church; and who, to the dogmas of a Pope, will answer in the language of CHRIST himself. This, he thinks, cannot be deemed an unfair or an incompetent method by the *unprejudiced* of either persuasion; and he who turns a deaf ear to the truths advanced in Holy Writ, must do so at his own peril, and be left to reconcile his ideas of Christianity in his own way. The writer has attentively compared the Papal and Protestant doctrines with the New Testament, and commenced doing so with a strong bias in favour of the former, since it was with

a view of becoming a member of the Romish Church that he was led to "search the Scriptures." This, it must be owned, was commencing the wrong way for the accomplishment of such an object, since the usual, and, indeed, *necessary* first step is an application to a priest, Papists themselves not being permitted to peruse the Scriptures. The consequence of this was, that, instead of being convinced of the purity of Popery, the writer was struck with the dissimilarity between the doctrines of our SAVIOUR and the POPE, or Church of Rome; and which, by the closer comparison, was obviously as different as meekness and arrogance, as charity and avarice, as lowliness of heart and insatiable ambition; and in the thorough conviction that *early impressions*, and the *restraint of the progress of intellect*, are the *strongest bulwarks of Papal power*, he determined on his present undertaking, in the consciousness of SIMPLE FACT being of greater intrinsic value than a host of traditionary tales without a single proof of their authenticity —marvellously-wrought miracles by the aid of ministering monks, mummery, and the credulity of wonder-seekers— by withered bones, tattered rags, and other "consecrated" rubbish of equal virtue—or than the many auxiliaries employed by the Church of Rome to stifle the influence of such FACTS, and evade their purpose.

Here, once for all, it is requested that it may be clearly understood, in whatever opinions may be quoted, and proof urged relative to the Popish Profession of Faith, no reproach or unkindly feeling is, or is intended to be, expressed towards the *members* of that Church, because they *are* such; neither has the mere profession of any doctrines a right to screen those whose public conduct is open to remark. We are, however, perfectly aware that there are *some* priests who make a point of rallying their flocks around them, and sympathetically painting the "heretical attacks" made upon their "Church," when it would better become such reverend gentlemen mildly to expose their weakness, than to meet

them with anathemas—to disprove them by the force of argument, rather than, by irritating language, to incite to the *argument* of physical force. In such cases it is not the people, but those who enlist them under the banner of clerical intolerance, who are to blame: nor ought a maudlin affectation of liberality to prevent any man from stating facts, and the less so when he professes to treat of fact only. Let not, therefore, the freedom with which the writer has alluded to miracles, or with which he may, and certainly *will*, allude to other component parts of Popery, give offence to the Papists themselves. If his assertions be true, why should they be objected to? If they be not so, let them be *disproved.* If the Papal doctrines are *not* blended with traditions and legends—if the quackery of monks has *not* been practised to persuade, to enforce, and to deceive, by means, already said, of "bones, rags," &c.—if these things *be not* so, then let the assertions stand as a memento of the writer's falsehood: but if they be TRUE, why should an *honest* member of the Church of Rome feel one jot of disapprobation towards him who makes them? In like manner, with any and all the statements, remarks, propositions, or conclusions, contained throughout the following pages—let them stand or fall as they are supported or disclaimed by FACT. He who differs in an opinion of religious faith from a body of men, whose political, civil, and religious existence depends upon the belief of those opinions which they themselves seek to promulgate by every means which human artifice can devise—such a man, when giving publicity to his own sentiments, lays himself fairly open to the animadversions of those to whose creed he is opposed: be it so—and as the writer is very likely to treat charlatanry with contempt, which is in itself truly contemptible, the Popish priest is invited to show, if he can, the fallacy of the present effort in proof of the PROTESTANT CHURCH being the TRUE CHURCH OF CHRIST; and whose doctrines are, at the *present day*, more closely allied

to those of the primitive Fathers than the "supreme" assumptions of Popery *ever were*—varied and arrogant as history proves them to have been. However, the writer intends not any reproach towards his Popish brethren; who, ere they are induced to condemn the belief of those who protest against the usurpation of the highest attributes of the CREATOR by the creature—let them first *examine* it. Let them compare Protestantism with Popery, and *both* with the Scriptures; nor longer fear darkness by seeking the celestial light of the Gospel. But, as this is not to be expected from strictly religious Papists without the permission of their clergy, and is, at the same time, a privilege of intellect which their clergy zealously endeavour to abrogate rather than to extend, let us request the latter themselves to show by practical examples in their own conduct (the natural results of their education) the superlative purity of their *tenets*, as compared with those of the Protestant pastors. The secular Popish priest receives confessions, and absolves from sin—sins, confesses, and obtains absolution. Forbidden to marry, he affects to live in a state of unnatural celibacy; yet, mingling with the world, and in its enjoyments, to him are revealed the most secret thoughts of that part of the other sex most likely to have strayed, who kneel to him for forgiveness. He assumes an arbitration between his flock and their consciences, and actually commands, pardons, and rejects, according to his discretion or caprice. The ties of father and husband, with all the kindlier feelings of humanity which they engender, are unknown to the Popish priest. He teaches his congregation—for so he has been taught to teach them—that their first and paramount duties in this world are to attend mass and the confessional, (over which, as an encouragement to the sinner, may be frequently seen the words "your sins are forgiven you!") and that there is no mortal sin so great as forsaking the doctrines of Popery, whilst eternal perdition is the irremedial lot of ALL who have

neglected to avail themselves of her widely-extended and sheltering arms. They preach too of abstemiousness; but let it be shown, where any temporal advantages were to be obtained by ecclesiastical intrigue for the Church of Rome or her members, wherein she has failed to employ the most eminent of her jesuitical* adherents; or that their theory of self-denial has not been immerged in their practical lusts of domination, influence, and profit.

---

* As this term may again be applied, it may not be improper here to give some account of the Order from whence it is derived. When the light of the Reformation exhibited the atrocities of the Romish church, and her late votaries protested against them throughout all Europe, the Pope (Paul III.) sought to recruit the number of his followers among the Pagans; and for this purpose gave every encouragement to an ignorant fanatical Spanish soldier, of the name of Inigo de Guipuscoa, more generally known as Ignatius Loyola, who, A. D. 1540, founded a society, impiously distinguished as the *Order of* Jesus. This man, ignorant as he was, was of an enterprising and fertile genius, and with sufficient prudence to listen to the advice of others who were wiser than himself in establishing his Order after he had arrived in Rome. This soldier saint (the ghostly honour was manufactured for him by Urban VIII., A. D. 1623,) when he first sought the confirmation of his order from Pope Paul, was opposed by Cardinal Guidiccioni; but Loyola, by "a solemn vow of *unlimited submission* and *obedience* to the Roman Pontiff," carried his point; *such* an Order being exactly what was required by the fallen interests of the Papal Church. Hence the zeal of the Jesuits in supporting the power of the Church of Rome, and hence the zeal of the "Church" in screening or vindicating jesuitical enormities. "The *professed members* are men of prudence and learning, deeply skilled in the affairs of the world, and dexterous in transacting all kinds of business, from long experience, added to their natural penetration and sagacity. In a word, they are the true and perfect Jesuits." The above account of these designing men is taken from Drs. Mosheim and Maclaine. The following is from a sermon preached by Bishop Brown, in Christ's Church, Dublin, A.D. 1551. (See Harleian Miscellany, referred to by Dr. Maclaine, vol. v. p. 566.) By some learned men it is spoken of as a *prophecy*. "But there are a new fraternity of late sprung up, who call themselves Jesuits, which will deceive many, who are much after the Scribes' and Pharisees' manner amongst the Jews. They shall strive to abolish the truth, and shall come very near to do it. For these sorts will turn themselves into several forms: with the Heathen a Heathenist, with the Atheists an Atheist, with the Jews a Jew, with the Reformers a Reformade, purposely to know your intentions, your minds, your hearts, and your inclinations, and thereby bring you at last to be like the fool that said in his heart 'There was no God.' These shall spread over the whole world, shall be admitted into the councils of princes, and they never the wiser; charming of them, yea, making your princes reveal their hearts and the secrets therein, and yet they not perceive it; which will happen from falling from the law of God, by neglect of fulfilling the law of God, and by winking at their sins; yet, in the end, God, to justify his law, shall suddenly cut off this society, *even by the hands of those who have most succoured them and made use of them;* so that, at the end, they shall become *odious to all nations*. They shall be worse than Jews, having no resting place upon earth; and then shall a Jew have more favour than a Jesuit!"—By the suppression of this Order in France, in the year 1762, and, notwithstanding their efforts, again abolished in that kingdom during the present year, 1828, and by the detestation in which they are held by the rest of mankind, generally, the above faithful summary of their character may be said almost to amount to a *prediction*.

Contrast the lives of the Popish priests—still bearing in mind the influence of education upon each—with the manners and habits of the ministers who act up to the doctrines of the "Reformed Church." The Protestant clergyman exhorts his flock to place their trust in God alone, and to seek salvation through the medium of his only Son JESUS CHRIST; an account of whose sacred mission it is his earnest care to recommend an attentive and oft-repeated perusal, as it was preserved for the unerring guide of posterity in the New Testament. His sermons teem not with invidious distinctions of persons; but according to the doctrines of his Church, he prays for ALL, as CHRIST has enjoined his followers to do, without an impious assumption of superhuman knowledge to distinguish what *amount* of penance is a *necessary* and an *adequate compensation for sin;*—nor affecting the right of condemning those to eternal perdition for whose errors he feels it his duty, as a Christian minister, to pray. As a husband and a father, whilst he feels and acknowledges the moral obligations these claims impose, he has a stronger incentive to illustrate by his own example the effects of the doctrines he teaches,—the affection and duty of his wife — the virtues and obedience of his children. Having made no vows which nature and opportunity incline him to break, and encircled by domestic enjoyments, whilst he zealously performs his *duty* to his GOD and to his NEIGHBOUR, he is a pattern to his flock, whom he "allures to brighter worlds, and leads the way." His clerical functions are not even supposed to disenfranchise him from the rights of a citizen; and, therefore, his advice and assistance are frequently sought and obtained to the more immediate advantage of his parishioners, generally. His life is simple,—the rigidity of a scholastic education is softened by the most tender and endearing affections of social life; and thus is the minister of the Established Church, at once, the best

spiritual guide, most loyal citizen, and good subject, whose practice accords with his profession.

Look on this picture, and on *this.*

The Protestant clergyman claims the rights of citizenship which he enjoys in common with his fellow-subjects; but, surely, it is an affectation in the Popish clergy to evince in the "assemblies of men" so great an eagerness to enjoy the "*sinful possessions of frail mortality*" whilst professing themselves "*by their office* and *functions to be* WHOLLY DEVOTED *to the service of* GOD, *and* THE CARE *of* SOULS?"—As we have professed not to introduce politics into the present examination,—with the question of civil rights, &c., we have nothing to do here, further than merely to observe, that we cannot see how those who declare in one place that they are "*wholly* devoted" to religion, can reconcile *such* devotion with their eager and vehement thirst after the sublunary temporalities of the world.

By the outline thus drawn of the practical doctrines of Protestant and Popish clergymen, it is not to be understood as giving any opinion of *individuals* of either persuasion. Among numerous bodies of men there must be always good and bad *people.* But who will say—or saying *prove,* that the Popish religion does not enjoin and empower a priest to sit for the picture here sketched of his clerical duties; or that the doctrines of the Protestant Church are not calculated deeply to impress upon her ministers the importance of every sacred and moral duty; and which are in themselves so expressive of peace, good will, and universal charity? It is sought not to *beg* either of these questions; as before observed, let FACT decide them: the first will be seen by the Popish "faith," which is about to be adduced; whilst for the principles of the Reformed Church,—as these are drawn from the Gospel itself, which "Book of Life" her members are taught to read in their vulgar tongue, it would

have been readily discovered, had they been opposed to the divine precepts of Christianity.

Should any *indelicacy* be found in the course of the extracts the writer may have occasion to make, the Papists must not charge him with impropriety on this score: since, were quotations from their own works not to be stated in precisely their own terms, they would be the first to insist upon the unfairness of so "*obvious*" a proceeding; and which would be attributed—not to the desire of drawing a veil over what an opponent might consider as gross or blasphemous, but—to a wish wilfully to pervert the sense and meaning, for the mere purpose of urging a contrary inference to that which *such* passages were intended to convey.

Fully aware of the motive which would attach to a Protestant did he not strictly adhere to the very letter in adducing a proof of the *errors* of Popery from Popish *orthodoxy*, the writer feels that he has no alternative; but trusts that members of the Reformed Church will not mistake for his any such Papal authorities he may deem it necessary, in proof of his assertions, to quote. He now calls upon the Romish priest—should any individual of such distinction think it worth his while to notice this "Examination," to refute it—not by the arts of jesuitical sophistry, but, if he can, by an honest appeal to scriptural truths. It will, even by the Papist himself, it is hoped, be acknowledged that they have been *fairly* brought forward and distinguished from the comments of profane writers on the present occasion, in opposition to the *selected*, and often *misquoted* and *irrelevant*, passages, strained to support the assumptions of Popery; nor can it, with justice, be deemed unfair to compare and contrast the writings of Papists with themselves and with each other; or, with their own freedom of assertion, to comment and draw natural conclusions from real facts.

CHRISTIANITY AND CATHOLICISM

CONTRASTED.

We now commence our "Grounds" of the Roman Catholic Faith with its *title-page*, determined that no *word* shall either be added to or subtracted from it until we arrive at its conclusion. We applied to our Roman Catholic friends to inform us *what* description of book it would be *first* necessary to peruse to obtain a knowledge of their "*profession of faith;*" and they recommended that which we are about to give entire; and which, on a similar application at the booksellers' whose names appear in the imprint, was readily handed down from the shelf.

> "The GROUNDS of the CATHOLIC DOCTRINE, as contained in the Profession of Faith, published by Pope Pius IV. By the Ven. and R. R. Richard Challoner, D. D. Bishop of Debra, and Vic. Apost. Twelfth Edition.
>
> "Be ready always to give an answer to every one that asketh you a reason of the hope that is in you."—1 *Pet.* iii. 15.
>
> "London: printed and published by Keating and Brown, 38, Duke-street, Grosvenor-square, and 9, Ivy-lane, Paternoster-row. 1823."

As the above title-page shows the work before us to have been first published by a Pope, and, in our own times, adapted by the late Dr. Challoner—a "venerable and right reverend bishop and vicar apostolical"—a divine whose "Garden of the Soul," &c. is deemed by the Popish clergy to be of greater importance to their flocks than Holy Writ, since the first is industriously circulated among them, whilst the latter they are forbidden (often on pain of excommunication) to peruse;—as the above

title-page is stamped, we say, with the authority of a pope and a bishop, it cannot be denied that we have been recommended to read the *best* summary of the Roman Catholic Faith extant. It will be perceived that its date is 1823; and as it is the "twelfth edition," we cannot but presume that every correction has been carefully made in so important a little apostolical *morceau* as Popish divinity itself could wish.

The motto adopted, either by the bishop or the pope, is from the 1st of Peter, iii. 15. Why "*meekness* and *fear*" should have been omitted we know not; surely Roman Catholics do not scorn the first and defy the last? The passage in the Testament runs thus: "But sanctify the Lord God in your hearts, and be ready to give an answer to every man that asketh you a reason of the hope that is in you, with *meekness* and *fear*." But we next come to the two first sentences (coupled together as one paragraph) of the Athanasian Creed, thus:—

> "Whosoever will be saved: before all things it is necessary that he hold the Catholic Faith. Which Faith, except every one do keep whole and undefiled: without doubt, he shall perish everlastingly."—*St. Athanasius's Creed.*

Nobody, we should think, will suppose that this brief extract is not evidently adduced to prove that, according to the Creed itself, none shall be saved but *Roman* Catholics. But as we find nothing further said of this Creed in the "Grounds" before us, and as it is retained by the Reformed Church, perhaps a few words upon the subject may not be deemed impertinent. In the early ages of Christianity there arose many schisms among the various churches, as Christ had himself foretold, and more particularly (as will be proved hereafter) after the assumption of *infallibility* by the Church of Rome.

The Athanasian Creed, as it is generally called, (many doubting if it was written by Athanasius,) does not, nor was it intended, to apply more particularly to the *Roman* Catholic than to the Eastern, Greek, or other *Catholic* churches. It

asserts the doctrines of the Gospel, and states explicitly what a Christian should believe. This was at a period when the schisms above alluded to were, as is the case in our own times, made a pretence by infidelity for introducing heresies, or the dangerous errors of fanatics and demagogues. Those whom we find most general in their expressions of disapprobation respecting this Creed are, it may be said, men who have given themselves the least trouble to understand it, according to the doctrines of the Reformed Church. "He that believeth not shall be damned," is an expression used by Christ himself, Mark xvi. 16; and St. Peter informs us "that there is no other name under heaven given to men by which we may be saved, but the name of JESUS." The Athanasian Creed expresses in as strong and precise terms to those for whose immediate guidance it was written, the consequence that attaches to the unbelief of the Christian Faith; and necessarily distinguishes the doctrines of the Trinity with respect to the exact manner in which it is to be understood by all orthodox Christians. The penalty, according to the belief of Protestants, as expressed in the Creed, applies to those who hold fundamental errors incompatible with the articles therein contained; and such errors, it has been shown, are condemned by Scripture also. Be it remembered, however, that the Protestant is not taught to believe the *whole creed* as *necessary to salvation;* but by the Creed itself all that is required of us is that "*before all things we hold the Catholic* (or universal) *Faith;*" *and the Catholic Faith is,* by the third and fourth verses, explained to be *this:* "*that we worship one* GOD *in Trinity, and Trinity in Unity, neither confounding the persons nor dividing the substance.*" This is all that is *required* to be believed; and to those who may have thought otherwise we recommend a more attentive perusal of the language of Christ himself.

As the term "*Catholic*" is supposed by some Protestants to be synonymous with Papist, and by still more Papists, as

they have been taught by their clergy, that it only applies to themselves, it should be understood, that the word Catholic or Universal, has been always applied by every Christian Church; why it is in England more generally used towards *Roman Catholics* than to others, will appear in its proper place. But the object of the Popish clergy, in prefixing the extract we have quoted from the Athanasian Creed to their profession of faith, cannot be misunderstood, any more than their little effort in distinguishing the term Catholic by *italics* throughout the Creed itself; as also in other of their publications. We now come to the "Profession," &c.

A Profession of Catholic Faith, &c.

I, *N. N.* with a firm faith believe and profess all and every one of those things which are contained in that Creed, which the Holy Roman Church maketh use of; viz. I believe in one God, the Father Almighty, Maker of Heaven and Earth, of all things visible and invisible; and in one Lord Jesus Christ, the only begotten Son of God; and born of the Father before all ages; God of God; light of light; true God of true God; begotten, not made: consubstantial to the Father, by whom all things were made. Who, for us men, and for our salvation, came down from heaven, and was incarnate by the Holy Ghost of the Virgin Mary, and was made man. Was crucified also for us under Pontius Pilate; he suffered and was buried: and the third day he rose again according to the scriptures: he ascended into heaven; sits at the right hand of the Father, and is to come again with glory to judge the living and the dead; of whose kingdom there shall be no end. And in the Holy Ghost, the Lord and Life-giver, who proceeds from the Father and the Son, who, together with the Father and the Son, is adored and glorified, who spoke by the prophets. And (I believe) one, holy, Catholic, and Apostolic Church: I confess one baptism for the remission of sins: and I look for the resurrection of the dead, and the life of the world to come.—*Amen.*

I most steadfastly admit and embrace apostolical and ecclesiastical *Traditions*, and all other observances and constitutions of the same Church.

I also admit the holy *Scriptures* according to that sense which our holy mother, the Church, has held, and does hold, to whom it belongs to *judge* of the true sense and interpretation of the scriptures: neither will I ever take and interpret them otherwise, than according to the unanimous consent of the Fathers.

I also profess, that there are truly and properly *seven sacraments*,

of the new law, instituted by Jesus Christ our Lord, and necessary for the salvation of mankind, though not all for every one: to wit, *baptism, confirmation, eucharist, penance, extreme unction, orders,* and *matrimony;* and that they confer grace: and that of these, *baptism, confirmation,* and *orders,* cannot be reiterated without sacrilege. I also receive and admit the received and approved *ceremonies* of the *Catholic Church,* used in the solemn administration of all the aforesaid sacraments.

I embrace and receive all and every one of the things which have been defined and declared in the holy council of *Trent,* concerning *original sin* and *justification.*

I profess, likewise, that in the mass there is offered to God a true, proper, and propitiatory sacrifice for the living and the dead. And that in the most holy sacrament of the *eucharist,* there is *truly, really,* and *substantially* the *body* and *blood,* together with the *soul* and *divinity* of our Lord Jesus Christ: and that there is made a conversion of the whole substance of the bread into the body, and of the whole substance of the wine into the blood; which conversion the *Catholic* Church calls *Transubstantiation.* I also confess, that under *either kind* alone Christ is received whole and entire, and a true sacrament.

I constantly hold, that there is a *purgatory,* and that the souls therein detained are helped by the suffrages of the faithful.

Likewise, that the *saints,* reigning together with Christ, are to be honoured and invocated, and that they offer prayers to God for us, and that their *relics* are to be had in veneration.

I most firmly assert, that the *images* of Christ, of the Mother of God, ever Virgin, and also of the other saints, ought to be had and retained, and that due honour and veneration is to be given them.

I also affirm, that the power of *indulgences* was left by Christ in the Church, and that the use of them is most wholesome to *Christian* people.

I acknowledge the *holy, catholic, apostolic, Roman Church,* for the mother and mistress of all churches; and I promise true obedience to the *Bishop of Rome,* successor to *St. Peter,* prince of the apostles, and vicar of Jesus Christ.

I likewise, undoubtedly, receive and profess all other things delivered, defined, and declared by the sacred canons and general councils, and particularly by the holy council of Trent. And I condemn, reject, and anathematize all things contrary thereto, and all heresies which the Church has condemned, rejected, and anathematized.

I, *N. N.* do at this present freely profess, and sincerely hold this true Catholic faith, without which no one can be saved; and I promise most constantly to retain and confess the same entire and unviolated, with God's assistance, to the end of my life.

Such is the Roman Catholic profession of faith at the present time; and that we may not expose ourselves to the liability of error, relative to that profession since 1823, we beg to notice the "Declaration" of the popish bishops of Ireland, dated 26th January, 1826. This declaration is comprised in fourteen Articles, religious and political, and is signed as follows :—

Patrick Curtis, D.D.	Cornelius Egan, D.D.	Peter Waldron, D.D.
Oliver Kelly, D.D.	William Crolley, D.D.	John Murphy, D.D.
Farrell O'Reilly, D.D.	Patrick Maguire, D.D.	James Doyle, D.D.
Peter M'Loughlin, D.D.	Patrick M'Mahon, D.D.	P. M. Nicholas, D.D.
James Magauran, D.D.	John M. Hale, D.D.	P. M. Gettigan, D.D.
George T. Plunkett, D.D.	Daniel Murray, D.D.	Edmund Ffrench, D.D.
James Keating, D.D.	Robert Laffan, D.D.	Thomas Coen, D.D.
Charles Tuohy, D.D.	J. O'Shaughnessy, D.D.	Robert Logan, D.D.
Edward Kiernan, D.D.	Thomas Costello, D.D.	Patrick Burke, D.D.
Patrick Kelly, D.D.	Kiaran Marum, D.D.	John Ryan, D.D.

The foregoing names being affixed to the "Declaration," it does away with any doubt as to its genuineness; yet, as it invariably occurs, whenever we have occasion to compare the documents of the "Infallible" Church with each other, that the discrepancy is palpable, so will it be evident to our readers that, whatever may have been the object in view, the "Profession" and the "Declaration" are, by no means, in strict accordance, either with regard to the theoretical or practical doctrines of Popery. Although the "Declaration" is the latest official document we have seen,* we shall in the course of our remarks, only quote such "articles" contained therein as relate to the "Profession of Faith;" and not to their *political* professions :—with the latter we have already said, we intend not to interfere. We now proceed to the "GROUNDS of the Roman Catholic doctrine;" and even *these*, when compared with the "*Profession*" above quoted, will appear somewhat too slender for any man to rely upon, who obeys this command of CHRIST :—"Yea, and why even of your own selves judge ye not what is right?"

* This observation was written early in the year 1827.

The Grounds of the Catholic Doctrine, as contained in the Profession of Faith of Pius IV.

CHAP. I.—OF THE CHURCH.

What is your Profession as to the article of the Church?

It is contained in those words of the Nicene Creed, "I believe one, holy, catholic and apostolic Church."

What do you gather from these words?

1. That Jesus Christ has always a true Church upon earth. 2. That this Church is always *one*, by the union of all her members in *one* faith and communion. 3. That she is always *pure* and *holy* in her doctrine and terms of communion, and consequently free from pernicious errors. 4. That she is *catholic*, that is, *universal*, by being the church of all ages, and more or less of all nations. 5. That this church must have in her a succession from the *apostles*, and a lawful mission derived from them. 6. (Which follows from all the rest.) That this true church of Christ cannot be any of the *Protestant* sects, but must be the ancient church communicating with the pope or bishop of Rome.

As this chapter consists in mere vain assertion, unsupported (like the twelve *New Articles* of Faith already given) by any thing in the shape of scriptural authority; to avoid unnecessary repetitions, we will pass on to the first section, where each article is separately treated of; and where it will be seen *what* portions of Holy Writ have been tortured—we really know not by what other term to express our meaning—to establish the doctrines of Popery to the prejudice of Christianity.

SECT. I.—*That Christ has always a* true Church *upon earth.*

How do you prove that Christ has always a true Church upon earth?

From many plain texts of scripture, in which it is promised or foretold that the church or kingdom established by Christ, should stand to the end of the world. Matt. xvi. 18. "Thou art Peter," (i. e. a rock) "and upon this rock will I build my church, and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it." Matt. xxviii. 19, 20. "Go ye therefore and teach all nations, baptizing, &c. teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you; and behold I am with you always, even to the end of the world." Ps. lxxii. 5. 7. "They shall fear thee as long as the sun and moon endure, throughout all generations.—In his days," that is, after the coming of Christ, "shall the righteous flourish and abundance of peace, so long as the

moon endureth." Dan. ii. 44. "In the days of these kings shall the God of heaven set up a kingdom," the church or kingdom of Christ, "which shall never be destroyed—and it shall stand for ever."

What other proof have you of the perpetual continuance of the Church of Christ?

The Creed in which we profess to believe the *holy* Catholic *Church.* For the *Creed* and every article thereof must be always true: and therefore there must be a holy *Catholic* Church.

Can you prove that Christ's church upon earth is *always visible?*

Yes, from many texts of scripture, as Isa. ii. 1, 2, 3, &c. and Micah iv. 1, 2, where the Church of Christ is described, "as a mountain upon the top of mountains, *exposed* to the view of all nations flowing unto it." And Dan. ii. 35, "As a great mountain filling the whole earth." Matt. v. 14. "As a city set on a hill which cannot be hid." Isa. lx. 11, 12, As a city whose "gates shall be open continually; and shall not be shut day nor night, that men may bring *thither* the forces of the Gentiles, and that their kings may be brought." Upon the *walls* of which city God has "set watchmen," Isa. lxii. 6, "which shall never hold their peace day nor night."

"That Christ has always a true Church upon earth," no Christian ever denies; but whilst it is readily admitted that Christ has always a true Church upon earth, what is there in the above extracts from the Scriptures to prove that the *Roman* is that Church?

It will be seen, in the course of the present examination, that Holy Writ has been unsuccessfully ransacked to establish the doctrines of Popery; but it cannot be too often repeated, nor too deeply impressed upon our readers, that these very brief sentences are ALL of the sacred writings permitted by the Romish Church to be perused by her followers; and of the aptness or the misapplication even of these, neither intending to turn to the right nor to the left from fact, we leave it to our readers themselves to decide.

The question is proposed, "*How do you prove,*" &c. It has never been disputed, that we ever heard of, we repeat, by Christians, that Christ's Church must be true; but the Pope has not yet told us what constitutes mankind members of that Church: but let those who would inquire, peruse the Gospel,

wherein it will be seen that those only are of his Church who follow the examples he has set them, and whom he himself tell us are "blessed."

Matthew, ch. v. 3. "Blessed are the poor in spirit; for THEIRS is the kingdom of heaven."

4. "Blessed are they that mourn; for they shall be comforted."

5. "Blessed are the meek; for they shall inherit the earth."

6. "Blessed are they which do hunger after righteousness; for they shall be filled."

7. "Blessed are the merciful; for they shall obtain mercy."

8. "Blessed are the pure in heart; for they shall see God."

9. "Blessed are the peace-makers; for they shall be called the children of God," &c. &c.

Whatever Church approximates the most nearly in its practice to these sacred precepts, we hesitate not to say is the truest Church of Christ; and if the *Romish* Church be the *meekest, purest,* and most *merciful* Church on earth, she certainly must *then* be the most true Church of Christ. In what degree, however, these heavenly attributes are allied to her, we shall hereafter, from her own mandates, be better enabled to judge. These are open to comment, certainly; but we shall draw our *positive proofs* from her own maternal bosom.

To the second question, "*What other proof have you,*" &c., as the only reason given for a professed belief, is, because "it *must* be always true;" we shall take leave to say that, from the "*Infallible head of a Church*" a little explanation on the subject of that which Protestants call the "Apostles' Creed," and Roman Catholics "the symbol of

the Apostles," would not have been out of place. This creed expresses the chief doctrines professed by Protestants; but as there are no allusions in it to *transubstantiation*, Papal *supremacy*, &c., it cannot be said to express the *chief* doctrines of Popery. Erasmus has denied that it was composed by the Apostles; and Mr. Charles Butler observes, that "if it were their composition, it seems unaccountable that it should not be mentioned in the *Acts** of the Apostles; that no reference to it should be found in any of the Apostolic epistles; that it was not included among the canonical writings; and that, when the council of Ephesus, and afterwards when the council of Chalcedon proscribed all creeds except the Nicene, neither excepted the symbol of the Apostles from the general proscription." However, as several writers have declared, that the articles of this creed were *agreed to* by the Apostles, Protestants distinguish it as theirs; and profess its belief, not merely because their spiritual directors have no better reason to give them in its favour than that "it *must* be true;" but because it really is that express faith which they are taught to believe, and in which their own conviction confirms them.

But we now come to the question of "Can you prove that Christ's Church upon earth is always visible?" And the reply, in the affirmative, is supported by quotations, first, from *Micah*, describing it "as a mountain upon the top of mountains, *exposed* to the view of all nations flowing unto it."

---

* Mr. C. Butler being a Roman Catholic himself—and by those of his own communion termed liberal, and justly acknowledged by all to be learned—this gentleman, a thorough *good* Romanist, who avows [See 'Book of the Rom. Cat. Ch.'] his belief that "full power was delegated to the Bishop of Rome by St. Peter;"—in the wafer changing, by the power of his Church, to real flesh and blood,—that sins are forgiven by his priest, &c. &c.—has he not, we ask, shown some *incautiousness* in his very rational appeal to the "Acts of the Apostles" to learn their own acts? To these "Acts" Protestants *always* appeal; and they, as all persons, calling themselves Christians, ought to do, rely upon them for their knowledge of *what* the Apostles taught and enforced. But from these Acts we learn not of *supremacy*, *purgatory*, *image-worship*, &c. &c. &c. Wherein do these "Acts" of the Apostles evince the *arrogance*, *avarice*, *impiety*, and *inhumanity*, of Popery?—We heartily wish all Papists to appeal to the Acts of the Apostles, and *contrast* them with the acts of their Popes.

From *Daniel*, "as a great mountain filling the whole earth;" and from *Matthew*, "as a city set on a hill, which cannot be hid," &c. Now, who, we ask, but a Pope, would seek to imply—or who, but the most ignorant Papist, could be led to suppose, that these *figurative* expressions were to be *literally* applied to material objects? If it be denied that any such interpretation is intended, why not have shown from the Scriptures that Christ's Church upon earth must always be distinguished from every other by her "GOOD WORKS?" But, instead of this, here is the "Visible Church" spoken of, as though the true Church of Christ might always be known by a stone or wooden *cross* placed upon the top of it; or, that, because St. Peter's at Rome is the *largest* church, the paths to its approach must lead direct to heaven. The texts applied above, "as a city set on a hill," &c., in proof of "Christ's Church on earth being always visible"—(the Pope having already, in the "Profession of Faith," insisted that this Church is *his own*)—are from the 5th of *Matthew*, the chapter from which we quoted the above extracts, and from which we extract the following, in illustration of the *true* sense and meaning of the above *line*. Our Saviour is addressing his disciples, and says,

Ver. 13. "Ye are the salt of the earth; but if the salt have lost its savour, wherewith shall it be salted? It is thenceforth good for nothing, but to be cast out, and to be trodden under foot of men."

14. "Ye are the light of the world. A city that is set on a hill cannot be hid."

15. "Neither do men light a candle, and put it under a bushel, but on a candlestick; and it giveth light unto all that are in the house."

16. "Let *your light* so shine before men that they may see your GOOD WORKS, and glorify your Father, which is in heaven."

Papists, as we have already observed, are not permitted to peruse the sacred Scriptures, lest that "light of the world," emanating from CHRIST himself, should, at once, show forth the pernicious doctrines of Popery. But, we exhort such of them as dare to, so far, transgress the mandates of the Vatican as to open the New Testament, as also our Protestant brethren (particularly those in Popish neighbourhoods), to compare the *particular lines* picked out of the Scriptures with the context of the whole chapters from whence they are selected, as in the instance just given, for the obvious purpose of misleading those not permitted to *inquire* into the truth. The most humble classes of our Irish Roman Catholic fellow-subjects—men who have never *seen* a Bible or Testament, and who could not read it although they had;—yet they are taught to say, that their "*clergy give Scripture* for all they say and do."

We beg to remind our readers, that by this way of perverting the Gospel—(and which, it will be seen, is persisted in throughout the whole Popish faith)—it may at all times be made subservient to the worst of temporal purposes. Suppose a Roman Catholic (either of the clergy or laity), who wished a scriptural excuse for following his own uncharitable inclinations:—he may, according to Papal quotation, *religiously* (! !) bid his debtor rot in gaol, and prove that he has scriptural authority for his hard-heartedness. The debtor we will imagine to sue somewhat after this sort:—"I am unable to pay your demand upon me, but, deprived of liberty, I have no hopes of doing so; let, then, my necessities plead in extenuation of the injury you may have sustained by what I owe you; release me from prison, and by my industry I shall be enabled to pay you by degrees." But to this appeal (were we to judge from Popish extracts from the Scriptures) the creditor would be wrong to attend; since his reply would be justified by the 5th of Matthew (as above quoted) v. 26—

"Verily, I say unto thee, thou shalt by no means come out thence till thou hast paid the uttermost farthing."

Direct as is the contrast of this expression of our SAVIOUR, in the sense in which we have thus applied it, to the meaning he himself explicitly conveyed to his disciples when it proceeded from his own lips; yet, can it be said to be a greater perversion of the truth and intent of the Gospel, than those sentences selected to prove that the doctrines of the Church of Rome are in unison with the doctrines of Christ? We think not: our readers will judge for themselves. We now proceed to

SECT. II.—*That Christ's Church upon earth is always* One.

How do you prove that Christ's Church upon earth can be but one?

From many texts of Scripture, *Song of Solomon*, vi. 9, 10. "My dove, my undefiled is but one—fair as the moon, clear as the sun, terrible as an army with banners." *John* x. 16. "Other sheep I have which are not of this fold," viz. the Gentiles, (who were then divided from the Jews) "them also I must bring, and they shall hear my voice, and there shall be one fold and one shepherd." *Eph.* iv. 4, 5. "There is one body and one spirit, as you are called in one hope of your calling, one Lord, one faith, one baptism." In fine, as we have seen already, the Church of Christ is a kingdom which shall stand for ever; and therefore must be always one. "For every kingdom divided against itself, is brought to desolation; and every city or house divided against itself shall not stand." *Matt.* xii. 25.

May not persons be saved in any religion?

No, certainly. St. Paul tells us, *Heb.* xi. 6. "That without faith it is impossible to please God; and St. Peter assures us, *Acts* iv. 12. "That there is no other name under heaven given to man by which we may be saved, but the name of Jesus." And Christ himself tells us, *Mark* xvi. 16. "He that believeth not shall be damned." So that it is manifest from the Holy Scripture, that true faith is necessary to salvation. Now *true faith*, in order to please God, and save our souls, must be *entire;* that is to say, we must believe *without exception* all such articles, as by God and his Church are proposed to be believed: and he that voluntarily and obstinately disbelieveth any one of these articles, is no less void of *true* saving *faith*, than he that disbelieves them all: as St. *James* tells, with regard to practical duties, chap. ii. 10. "Whosoever shall keep the whole law, yet offend in one point, is guilty of all." Hence St. Paul, *Gal.* v. 20, reckons heresies, that is, false religions, amongst those works of the flesh, of which he pro-

nounces, "that they who do such things shall not inherit the kingdom of God:" and God himself, *Isa.* lx. 12, tells his Church, "the nation and kingdom that will not serve thee shall perish."

Can any one be out of the way of salvation without the guilt of mortal sin?

No. But all such, as through obstinacy, negligence, or indifference in matters of religion, will not hear the true church and her pastors, are guilty of mortal sin. *Matt.* xviii. 17, "If he neglect to hear the church, let him be to thee as a heathen man and a publican." *Luke* x. 16. "He that heareth you," (the pastors of the church) "heareth me; and he that despiseth you, despiseth me; and he that despiseth me, despiseth him that sent me."

But what do you think of those whose conscience persuades them that they are in the true church?

If this error of theirs proceed from invincible ignorance, they may be excused from the sin of heresy; provided, that in the sincere disposition of their hearts, they would gladly embrace the truth, if they could find it out, in spite of all opposition of interest, passion, &c. But if this *error* of their conscience be not *invincible*, but such as they might discover if they were in earnest, in a matter of so great consequence; their conscience will not excuse them, no more than St. *Paul's*, whilst out of blind zeal he persecuted the church; or the mistaken conscience of the *Jews*, when putting the disciples of Christ to death, they thought they did a service to God, *John* xvi. 2. "For there is a way that seemeth right unto a man; but the ends thereof are the ways of death." *Prov.* xvi. 25.

But does not the Scripture somewhere say, "that a remnant of all religions shall be saved?"

No: though I have often heard such words alleged by Protestants, they are not anywhere to be found in Scripture, from the beginning of Genesis to the end of Revelations. I suppose, what has given occasion to their mistake, must have been the words of St. Paul, *Rom.* ix. 27, where, quoting *Isaiah* x. 22, he tells us, "Though the number of the children of Israel be as the sand of the sea, a remnant (that is, a small part of them only) "shall be saved:" which remnant the Apostle himself explains, *Rom.* xi. 5. of such of the Jewish nation as at that time by entering into the Church were saved by God's grace. But what is this relation to a salvation of a remnant of all religions? A doctrine so visibly contradicting the Scripture, that even the English Protestant Church herself, in the 18th of her 39 articles, has declared them to be *accursed*, who presume to maintain it.

That CHRIST's Church upon earth is always one, and *in heaven also*, we are not inclined to dispute, and this admission will spare us the trouble of commenting on the two or three sentences picked out of the Scriptures to prove it, and

which we should suppose, in consequence of Papal feuds, are decidedly against the question as applied by the Pope to his own Church. But we must be permitted to add, that although all are *one* Church to CHRIST, of which he alone is the *Head*, yet are there two *states* of the same Church, the one *militant* and the other *triumphant*, "of whom the whole family in heaven and earth is named." *Eph.* iii. 15. Heaven, earth, and hell are but as one kingdom to God, for his kingdom ruleth over all. "The kingdom is the Lord's; and he is the Governor among the nations." *Psal.* xxii. 28. All nations are one kingdom to HIM, whose wisdom has disposed that these should be governed by various rulers according to the capacities of his creatures. We read not in Holy Writ that he ever appointed a *universal monarch* of the world; and the present degenerate state of Rome shows us the consequences of ungoverned ambition; since the weight of her own magnificence sunk her beneath the level of the nations she had conquered. Thus has it been with the Church. The divisions which *Rome* has made has broken its *unity;* and by an assumption of supremacy and infallibility she has, for the preservation of her *authority*, introduced similar *blessings* to mankind, as it may be imagined an Universal Monarch would have done to have enforced obedience to his despotic power: she has marked her *universality* by the blood of her victims, sacrificed to the lust of domination; whilst, instead of an appeal to the benign and persuasive doctrines of Christianity, her *arguments* have been the sword, the stake, and the gibbet; or have otherwise been exerted within the secret walls of an Inquisition! But we will give our authority for the means adopted by the *holy* Roman Catholic Church for the extermination of heresies in its proper place. Every one who believes in CHRIST is a Christian, as those who believe in Mahomet are Mahomedans. But it is not enough that we believe in Christ, but that we keep his commandments also. "Not every one that saith unto me, Lord, Lord, shall enter

into the kingdom of heaven; but he that doeth the will of my Father which is in heaven."—*Matt.* vii. 21.

To the rest of the questions and replies which occur throughout this section we beg particular attention, as they are intended to instil into the mind of youth that—with the comparatively small exception of those who have been taught to believe in Popery—the whole of GOD'S creatures must assuredly be damned! Horrible and revolting, indeed, is such a doctrine as this to reason and to humanity; false, hypocritical, and blasphemous it is towards the GREAT CREATOR of the Universe; who, instead of the fountain of mercy, is thus silently represented (as we heard him publicly described in a Popish chapel *) as "a CRUEL, SEVERE, and INEXORABLE JUDGE!!!"

We can only hope, in despite of the evidence of our own senses, that we do not understand the meaning of the text as it stands printed before us. If so, we intreat our Popish brethren to set us right; but as, according to our most solemn belief, it is intended to bear the construction we have put upon it, *viz.* that the GREAT GOD has doomed all mankind to eternal perdition, except those who profess their belief in Popery,—can it be unfair to comment upon tenets so directly opposed to the decrees of a just and merciful Creator?—can it be wrong to refute them by his holy word? Surely not; and should our efforts induce but *one* member of the Church of Rome to "search the Scriptures," we shall not think they have been employed in vain.

It is asked, "May not persons be saved in any religion?" The positive reply to which is "*No, certainly.*" The sentences of Scripture quoted in support of this assertion are, first, from *Heb.* xi. 6, and from *Acts* iv. 12. Paul, in writing to the Jews on the necessity of faith in God, says, "But without faith it is impossible to please him."

This is the first passage alluded to; and what has this to

* Somers' Town.

do with the question, as implied, that none can be saved but the followers of the Pope, a title unknown until usurped, as will be shown, many ages afterwards? Paul, in the chapter alluded to by the Pontiff (for, is it more than an allusion?), explains what faith is, and the fruits thereof; exemplifying it by the acts of Abel, Enoch, Noah, Abraham, Isaac, Jacob, Joseph, &c., who "having obtained *a good report* through faith, received not the promise." (ver. 39.) With respect to the next sentence of Scripture in the above reply, that "there is *none other* name [than CHRIST] under heaven given among men whereby we must be saved;" is there any —*can* there be any Christians who believe otherwise? But does this lead us to imagine that the millions who have not yet even heard tell of salvation by the name of JESUS, are to perish everlastingly for the want of that which it is their greatest misfortune to be without—the *knowledge* of CHRIST, who died for the sins of ALL MANKIND? From the Christian is required faith and repentance; but the Heathen will be judged by the law of morality implanted in his heart, and which is called *natural religion*. As the knowledge of God is given to the one, more, of course, is expected from him than from the other. But is it because GOD has made a covenant with the Christian, that he, calling himself Christian, is to pronounce a curse against the less favoured Heathen rather than leave him in the hands of an all-powerful though *uncovenanted* mercy? The next sentence *in proof* of the question is, "He that believeth not shall be damned." But CHRIST has nowhere denounced those not doomed to *hear* of him FOR not believing.

Rom. v. 13.—"For, *until the law*, sin was not in the world; but sin is *not imputed* when there is no law.

—— ix. 25.—"As he (the LORD) saith also in *Osee* [*Hosea*], I will call them My people, which were not my people; and her [*i. e.* the nation] Beloved, which was not beloved.

1 Cor. v. 12.—"For what have I to do to judge them also that are *without? Do not ye judge* them that are within?

——— 13.—"But them that are without, God judgeth.

Rom. ix. 26.—"And it shall come to pass, *that* in the place where it was said unto them, Ye *are not my people;* there shall they be called the children of the living God."

If these texts be not sufficient to show the grossness of the assumption that salvation can be extended to none but the believers in Popery, let those who would seek further proofs that such impious doctrines—(we merely write as we feel)—are opposed to the divine precepts of Christianity, let them "search the Scriptures," which will make irresistible appeals to their understandings and to their hearts. They will therein learn that the "Mercy of God *rejoiceth* against judgment," (James ii. 13), and that "God is no respecter of persons." (Acts x. 34.)

But we request the patience of our readers whilst we point out to them the way in which the Pope blends religion and impiety, as they will frequently have occasion to notice, whilst drawing the falsest possible conclusions from his own unwarrantably-assumed propositions. "True faith," says he, "in order to please God and save our souls, must be *entire; that is to say*, we must believe, without exception, all such articles as by God and his Church [the *Popish Church!*] are proposed to be believed; and he that voluntarily and obstinately disbelieveth *any one* of these articles is no less void of *true saving faith* than he that disbelieves them all," &c. Now, how can any man who has perused the New Testament, read such tenets as those which we are wading through, and not feel the bane of their influence in all social intercourse, and, what is evidently of much greater importance, of their direct tendency—or, perhaps, we should say, positive effect—in betraying souls from a reliance upon the merits of the Saviour of the World into the deplorable darkness in-

separable from doctrines instituted by the speculative theories of men—of men who oppose the temporal interests of their Church against the promised salvation of all the rest of mankind? Let us see *what* kind of "Articles" are those coupled by the Church of Rome with those left for our guidance by the word of God. We will first notice the canon of Urban II.*, which is thus expressed:—"*We do not consider those as homicides,* who, *burning with zeal* for the (Roman) Catholic Church against excommunicated persons, *happen to have killed any of them!*" "This canon *still,*" says Dr. Phillpotts, "has its place in the ecclesiastical code, and is part of the *law* of the Church of Rome."—Where are such encouragements held out to 'zealous' murderers in the New Testament? Again, "Such is the sacredness of the obligation to obey the (Romish) Church, that, even *at the day of judgment,* the sinner *who has erred by following its commands* may thus address the HEAVENLY JUDGE, and *claim forgiveness as of right!!!* 'Lord, if it be an error which we have followed, *thou thyself hast deceived us* by thine own plain and reiterated direction, that we should hear the Church even as we hear Thee. *Thou thyself hast deceived us* by thy apostles, by the pastors and teachers appointed by thee for the perfecting of the saints, for the edifying of thy body—who have commanded us so to do. THOU THYSELF *hast deceived us* by thy Church, called by St. Paul the pillar and ground of the truth, which Church has never ceased to exact from her children a firm assent to all her decrees, *threatening an everlasting curse against those who dare to rebel against her.* Conscious, alas! of our own ignorance in divine things, and of the weakness of man's understanding, how could we rely on ourselves in searching the Scriptures, and despise an authority so exalted? *Confidently, therefore, we say, O Lord, if it be an error which we*

* 47 Ca. 23. Qu. vi. Excommunicatorum.

have followed, THOU THYSELF HAST DECEIVED US, AND WE ARE EXCUSED.' " *

Where is such blasphemy as this to be found but in Popish books? If the extract just quoted be *not* in the "Class Book" used in the College of Maynooth, would it not be better to *disprove* than to *abuse* the evidence quoted? But who can feel surprise at the consequences of unchecked Popery — that the ALMIGHTY's glorious name should be spoken of in conjunction with a "Church" whose members write thus, and condemn to eternal perdition *all* who disbelieve any *one* of their "Articles?" We give another of them. "Our University knows, that, *by the mouth of the Sovereign Pastor,* it is GOD HIMSELF *who speaks* to the flock over which the HOLY GHOST has constituted *him* the Universal Bishop, to govern the Church of God!!!" (Hist. des Papes, t. v. p. 476, par Fr. Bruys.) The above was sent from the University of Coimbra in 1717, to Pope Clement XI., to assure him of the firm belief of its members in his infallibility.

As the whole of the section on which we are treating is intended to show that none can be saved but the believers in Popery, and thinking we have sufficiently proved, by the Scriptures, the fallacy of so vain yet wicked an assertion, we should deem it too severe a trial of our readers' patience to notice the inapplicable few lines perverted to the Pope's *proof* on the subject, which follow, farther than to observe that the expression of Christ to his Apostles,—"He who heareth you heareth me," &c. was *not* addressed to *Roman* Catholics, but to those whose preaching and practice was directly opposed to the preachings and practices of Popery from its commencement to the present hour. Observe how a *line,* picked out of the *old law,* is applied by the Pope to himself—"*The nation and kingdom that* WILL NOT SERVE

* See Evidence in the House of Lords, (in 1825,) page 268.

THEE, SHALL PERISH ! ! !" This, surely, speaks plainly enough ?

If we have made any unfaithful extracts in the course of our remarks upon the last Section, we beg to be corrected by our Roman Catholic brethren; if they cannot show that we have done so, what little will it import them merely to say, as we have often heard it expressed, that "the Roman Catholics of *England* know nothing about these things," &c. We know that they do *not;* and we *wish* them to know more of the doctrines of their Church than it has been deemed expedient to teach them. How few English Papists will believe that their Protestant relatives *must,* according to the tenets of Popery, be damned ? But how very few of the former persuasion, in Roman Catholic countries, believe that they will *not?* Be it remembered, however, that we are not speaking so much of the great body of our Popish fellow-subjects as *to* them; it is not to them we are opposed, but to their doctrines of faith, as we truly believe these to be opposed to the divine precepts of JESUS CHRIST. The 18th Article of the Reformed Church, alluded to in the Section we are treating of, is this :—"They also are to be had accursed that presume to say, that every man shall be saved by the law or sect which he professeth, so that he be diligent to frame his life according to *that law and the light of Nature.* For Holy Scripture doth set out unto us only the name of JESUS CHRIST whereby men must be saved." What, we ask, is objectionable to a CHRISTIAN in this Article? Is it not the language of the Gospel ? But Papists must, of course, apply (as they are taught to do) to the *Pope* to obtain salvation !

We now approach the *infallible* part of our subject, and which, like those already treated of, whilst we condemn, it will be our effort to disprove. It is decidedly the most pernicious of all Popish doctrines—(since from this all else that

is objectionable, all that is derogatory to Christ's word, and to common sense, proceeds)—to all men calling themselves Christians, save in the opinion of Papists alone; and we beg particular attention to the even more than usually meagre portions of Holy Writ that could be found by Popery, capable of being distorted, as in the least bearing upon the question, to so preposterous, and, as we think, to so abominable a purpose.

SECT. III.—*That the Church of Christ is always* holy *in her doctrine and terms of communion, and always free from pernicious errors.*

How do you prove this?

1st. Because, as we have seen above from *Matt.* xvi. 18, our Lord Jesus Christ, who cannot tell us a lie, has promised, that his church should be *built upon a rock*, proof against all floods and storms, like the house of the wise builder, of whom he speaks, *Matt.* vii. 25; and that *the gates of hell*, that is, the powers of darkness, shall never *prevail against it.* Therefore the Church of Christ could never cease to be *holy* in her doctrine; could never fall into idolatry, superstition, or any heretical errors whatsoever.

2dly. Because Christ, who is "the way, the truth, and the life," *John* xiv. 6, has promised, *Matt.* xxviii. 19, 20, to the pastors and teachers of the church, to "be with them always, even to the end of the world." Therefore they could never go astray by pernicious errors: for how could they go out of the right way of truth and life, who are assured to have always in their company, for their guide, him who is the *way*, the *truth*, and the *life*.

3dly. Because our Lord has promised to the same teachers, *John* xiv. 16, 17, "I will pray the Father, and he shall give you another Comforter, that he may abide with you FOR EVER, even the SPIRIT OF TRUTH:" and ver. 16, he assures them that this Spirit of Truth "shall teach them ALL THINGS:" and chap. xvi. 13, "that he shall guide them INTO ALL TRUTH." How then could it be possible that the whole body of these pastors and teachers of the church, who, by virtue of these promises, were to be for ever guided *into all truth* by *the Spirit of Truth*, should at any time fall from the truth by errors in faith.

4thly. Because, *Isaiah* lix. 20, 21, God has made a solemn covenant, that after the coming of our Redeemer, his *spirit* and his *words*, that is, the whole doctrine which this Redeemer was to teach, should be for ever maintained by his church through all generations. "The Redeemer shall come to Zion, &c. This is my covenant with them, saith the Lord: my spirit which is upon thee, and my words which

I have put into thy mouth, shall not depart out of thy mouth, nor out of the mouth of thy seed, nor out of the mouth of thy seed's seed, saith the Lord, from henceforth and for ever."

5thly. Because the Church of Christ is represented, *Isaiah* xxxv. 8, as "a highway, a way of holiness," a way so plain and so secure, that even "fools should not err therein." How then could it ever be possible that the church herself should err?

6thly. Because pernicious errors in faith and morals must needs be such as to provoke God's indignation: now God Almighty has promised to his church, *Isaiah* liv. 9, 10, "As I have sworn that the waters of Noah shall no more go over the earth, so have I sworn that I would not be wroth with thee, nor rebuke thee: for the mountains shall depart, and the hills be removed, but my kindness shall not depart from thee, neither shall the covenant of my peace be removed, saith the Lord that hath mercy on thee." So that as we are assured that there shall not be a second flood; so we are that the Church of Christ shall never draw upon herself the wrath of God by teaching errors contrary to faith.

In fine, the church is called by St. Paul, 1 *Tim.* iii. 15, "The pillar and ground of the truth;" therefore she cannot uphold pernicious errors. From all which it is manifest, that the Church of Christ is infallible in all matters relating to faith; so that she can neither add nor retrench from what Christ taught.

It may be presumed, to understand the meaning of this Section, it is intended to show, as it expresses, that the Popish church has ever been, is, and must ever continue to be, *infallible;* or, as this infallibility is, in the present case, intended, we imagine, to be *modestly* expressed, "*always holy* in her doctrine, and terms of communion; and always free from pernicious errors:" and, as the natural consequence, resulting from the belief in her undeviating holiness, all mankind must incur the penalty of damnation who do not believe (as the *Pope* has already said) every one of "all such articles" as he, or his Church, may choose at any time to propose to be believed.

In reply to the first question, the reason given is, "*because, as we have seen, Matt.* xvi. *ver.* 18, (in the first Section,) our Lord Jesus Christ, who *cannot tell us a lie,* has promised that his Church should be built upon a rock," &c. But, as it is assumed throughout the Section before us, that

the Papal church is built upon this "rock," and as this "rock" has been before, and will again be, brought forward as the strongest foundation upon which the Pope relies for his *temporal* power, we beg to notice, in the outset, that there is no *allusion*, in the NEW TESTAMENT, to any *such* church, or *such Pope* at the head of it, as that established upon the rock of superstition at Rome. The *sentence* quoted as the strongest support of Popery is from the above text, and is thus expressed: "Thou art Peter, (in the Greek, *Cephas*, a rock,) and upon this rock will I build my church; and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it." As it may be the most explicit way to notice each paragraph of the present Section separately, ere we show by scriptural proof the dangerous fallibility of relying upon the *infallible* assumptions of a Pope, we entreat the Roman Catholics, who may peruse what we write, to read the *whole chapter* (Matt. xvi.) from whence the above is extracted. It is headed thus: "The Pharisees seek a sign, Peter *reproved:*" at the 18th verse the *two lines* occur which are the *chief scriptural* support on which the "infallibility" rests; yet, when CHRIST tells his disciples what was to happen to him, and Peter said, "This shall not be unto thee," CHRIST, in the *same chapter*, (ver. 23,) *reproves* him thus:—"*Get thee behind me, Satan: thou art an offence to me; for thou savourest not the things that be of God, but those that be of men.*" "The pastors of the Church," spoken of in the second paragraph, are the *eleven disciples* whom Christ addressed "in a mountain of Galilee"—somewhat different from Popish priests, certainly. As the third paragraph acknowledges that the expressions of CHRIST, quoted from xivth of John, were addressed "to the *same teachers*," (the Disciples,) it carries, we think, its own refutation along with it. But read the fourth reason extracted from Isaiah; and instead of "The Redeemer shall come to Zion," *&c.*, we will take the *whole verse;* "And the Redeemer shall come to Zion, and *unto them* that *turn from*

transgression, in Jacob, saith the Lord." But had not the Pope seen that the Church of the Jews, to whom the promises were addressed, had deprived itself of the promised blessing? "*But ye are departed out of the way; ye have caused many to stumble at the law; ye have corrupted the covenant of Levi, saith the Lord,*" Mal. ii. ver. 8. Now, could even the promise of God to the Jews be shown to have *any relation whatsoever* to Popery, the condition implied (*obedience*) not being fulfilled, the misapplication of the text quoted would never have satisfied any but such as could be prevailed upon to take their salvation upon *trust*, rather than to read the Word of God.

The fifth "*because*" speaks of the Church of Christ as "a highway to holiness," that "fools should not err therein." Doubtless, all true Christians believe it to be so. Popery alone seeks to make it a *bye* way; and by an exaction of the most debasing subserviency of mind, menaces REASON with a curse (since the "tower of her strength" is a blind obedience in her votaries); whilst her immense wealth (where Popery has obtained an ascendancy), arising from the traffic in pardons and indulgences, gifts of devotees, &c. &c.—these show that she is not inattentive to the *tolls* to be paid by all the good people who pass through the gate of *Priestcraft*, of which, Christian evidence—contrasted with the doctrines of the Romish Church—reason, experience, and conviction, fully prove she really possesses the *key*.

The sixth reason is (see *Isaiah* liv.), from God's promise of amplification to the Gentile church; and the last *line* from St. Paul to Timothy is emphatically wound up by the (we think) unfortunate—certainly *untrue*—assertion, that the Popish Church "is *infallible* in all matters relating to faith; so that she can *neither add to, nor retrench from what* CHRIST *taught*." A *parrot*, taught by a Pope to do so, could as readily *say* as much. But we adhere to FACT alone; and now to our scriptural proofs, in support of our *protest* against so

wicked an anomaly, thus conveyed in the last quotation. Our own feelings will, we trust, protect us from using *intemperate* expressions, as our inclinations are (which we show by giving the *whole Book* we treat of) to deal with fairness. But we really know not how to express shamelessness otherwise than by the term *impudence;* and with the *Twelve New Articles of Faith,* which the council of Trent has added to the Apostles' creed, before us, is it not a direct insult to common sense to tell us that they do not (or, as it is implied, *could* not, though they *would*) add to nor subtract from the doctrines of Christ? Where there *have* been *subtractions* from the institutions of OUR LORD, we shall show in its proper place;—how the papal authorities reconcile such errors with the positive and terrible curse denounced (*Rev.* xxii. *ver.* 18, 19) against those who "add" or "take away" from those institutions, they themselves only know.

Now, having seen all the scriptural proofs adduced by Popery in support of her "Infallibility in all matters relating to Faith," we will here show our English Catholic readers *what degree* of Faith it is necessary for them to possess:—"*If the* POPE *should command the practice of vice and forbid virtue; the Church is bound* to *believe* VICE *to be* GOOD, and VIRTUE *to be* WICKED"(!!!)—*Bellarm. De Rom. Pont. l.* 4. *c.* 5. One more degree of Faith in the *Infallibility* of the Church of Rome:—"*If the Pope were to be so wicked as to carry with him innumerable people, by troops, as slaves, to hell, to be with himself for ever tormented; yet, no mortal man whatever must presume here to reprove his faults, because he is judge of all, and himself to be judged of none.*"—*Decret. part.* 1. *dist.* 40. By way of elucidation to the foregoing, we shall quote an extract from the opinion of Mr. Charles Butler, of Lincoln's Inn:—"Every *true Roman Catholic* believes that *nothing* CAN be *wrong* in the faith of the Church; but *they admit* that when Luther made his *attack* upon the Church of Rome, *much* REFORMATION *in*

the Church, both in respect to its HEAD and ITS MEMBERS, *was wanting* in *discipline* and *morals.*"—*L. of Eras. note to p.* 84. We think Mr. B. might have very safely added, "such will ever be the case with such a Church."

We will not tire our readers in *disproving* the TRUTH of the above doctrines, put forth by Pontificals, Decretals, and Mr. Butler; but briefly turn to the first passages which come to hand in the New Testament, innumerable as they are, applicable to the present subject:—

Matthew, ch. vii. v. 15. "Beware of false prophets, which come to you in *sheep's clothing,* but inwardly they are ravenous wolves."

V. 16. "Ye shall know them by their fruits," &c.

V. 17. "Even so, every good tree bringeth forth good fruit; but a corrupt tree bringeth forth evil fruit."

V. 20. "Wherefore *by their fruits* ye shall know them."

V. 21. "Not every one that saith unto me, Lord, Lord, shall enter into the kingdom of heaven; but he that doeth the will of my father, which is in heaven."

V. 22. "Many will say to me, *in that day,* Lord, Lord, have we not *prophesied* in thy name? And in thy name have cast out devils? And in thy name have done many wonderful works?"

V. 23. "And then, will I profess unto them, *I never knew you;* depart from me, ye that work iniquity."

However personally and universally infallible the Pope and the rest of his Church may choose to be, we must not forget that the Apostles did not assume so much. St. Peter erred, and "walked not uprightly according to the truth of the Gospel;" for many were "carried away" with his dissimulation. "*Gal.* ii. 13, 14." St. Paul owned, that in some cases he had no commandment of the Lord, but spoke "*by permission,*" as a private person. In other cases, he says, "I command, yet not I but the Lord."—"And to the rest speak I, not the

Lord." And "it is so after my judgment; and I think also that I have the spirit of God," &c.—1 Cor. vii. 6, 10, 12, 25, 40. Again:—

2 Cor. i. 24. "Not for that we have *dominion over your Faith*, but are helpers of your joy. For by faith [i. e. *by your own faith*] ye stand."

Gal. i. 8. "But, though we, or an angel from heaven, preach any other Gospel unto you than that which we have preached unto you, let him be accursed."

Now, the twelve *New Articles* being directly opposed to the Gospel of CHRIST, Papists would do well to contrast them with that Gospel, if they deem the salvation of their own souls worth a consideration.

But, knowing as we do that the *New Testament* is, by the Popish clergy, cast aside for the introduction of their own compositions (such as we have already quoted), this being their rule of faith * in the Church of Rome, accordingly, the Church having shown by what tenure she holds her infallibility, we now beg to show, by her own positive assertion, that she declares she is *not* INFALLIBLE! We are not, however, at present, going back to those days when so impious an assumption *first* struck alarm in the minds of all good men; *that* we shall show hereafter. But we are about to appeal to no less an authority than the DECLARATION already noticed, signed by *thirty Popish Bishops*, on the 26th of January, 1826—and from which, whilst we urge it in proof of our assertions, our readers will draw the most positive assurances.

In Article 11 of the above "Declaration," these gentlemen (the Popish Bishops) declare UPON OATH, "That it *is not an article of the* (Roman) *Catholic faith, neither are they thereby required to believe that the Pope* IS *infallible*." This Decla-

* The rule of its Faith "is the teaching authority of the *successors of the Apostles*."—Faith of Catholics, &c. Berington and Kirke, 1813.

ration is, we think, as plainly expressed as the assertion is positively made in the "Grounds of Faith," quoted above of the infallibility? However, as Popery cannot err, the Church of Rome, it is evident, has merely to *say* (as we have shown her clergy acknowledge) that

> Vice is virtue, virtue vice;
> Lies are truths, and truths lies,

And, such is the Popish doctrine of her infallibility, all *good* Papists are as fully convinced of her miraculous powers in this respect, as in her *evident* tact in conjuring a wafer, made of a little flour, and a glass of wine, into the real body and blood of our Redeemer. We really beg pardon of the Roman Catholic *laity;* but if that which is contemptible be not contemptuously treated—if falsehood upon falsehood so bunglingly jumbled together by "infallibility," as to oblige one moiety of itself to contradict the other—if such puerile efforts to deceive are to be treated with gravity, let the Romish clergy first show some better scriptural "Grounds" for the authority they have usurped over the minds of their followers than we have yet met with; and above all, let them, as we do, prefer *proof* to *assertion*, and *fact* to *sophistry*—we will then meet them as gravely as they please. But this will never suit the Church of Rome; HER favourite children must give up their inward and outward senses:—REASON first, and then, as a matter of course, seeing, hearing, feeling, taste, and smell;—all must be sacrificed at the shrine of infallibility in the court or Church of Rome; but whether this Infallible Church *is* the Court, the Pope, a General Council, or all these together, the Popish writers cannot, nor ever will, agree*.

* Some place the infallibility in the Pope, as "heir and successor of St. Peter;" but, as so many Popes have been deposed and slaughtered for their heresies by other Popes—the successful one always (*pro tem.*) being acknowledged orthodox—there are others who place the "infallibility" in a *general council* as superior to the Pope; a third party define it to be lodged only in the Pope and a council together; but as this arrangement would defeat the *dicta* of many councils, which are called *general*, and would split others into fractions (as in the cases when the Pope or his

Sin is the greatest error of any church; but popery has the most deeply involved herself by (among her other absurdities) her claim to *infallibility* in this her *notoriously corrupt* state—applying to her Church whatever is said of the Church of CHRIST in its *perfect, glorious,* and *triumphant* state. These are assumptions that have been often lamented by the pious and well-informed of her own communion. The Church of Rome certainly *requires* infallibility to *prove* her *imperfections perfections;* otherwise, the most illiterate of her followers would tremble for their salvation. But when "CHRIST *shall gather out of his Kingdom all things that offend, and them which do iniquity,*" (Matt. xiii. 41,) then, and not till then, must man seek impeccability on earth.

SECT. IV.—*That the Church of Christ is* Catholic or Universal.

What do you understand by this?

Not only, that the Church of Christ shall always be known by the name of CATHOLIC, by which she is called in the Creed; but that she shall also be called *Catholic* or *Universal,* by being the church of all ages, and of all nations.

How do you prove that the true Church of Christ must be the church of all ages?

Because the true Church of Christ must be that which had its beginning from Christ; and, as he promised, was to continue to the end of the world. See Sect. I. and III.

How do you prove that the true Church of Christ must be the church of all nations?

---

legate has withdrawn from them, declaring them no longer *lawful* councils but "*schismatical conventicles,*" as was said of the councils of Constance, and Basil or Basle)—and because, among many other reasons assigned, human passions not consistent with infallibility have generally influenced these "infallible" councils—for these and other reasons a fourth party place it neither in Pope nor council separately nor together, but in the *church militant,—i. e.* in the whole body of her followers who serve and obey her, wherever or however dispersed throughout the world!

"When the Council of Constance had determined that the cup should be taken from the laity, the Bohemians were so much dissatisfied, that the Council of Basle restored it to them. Which council was infallible? Which decree is to be *undoubtedly* received? The Council of Basle, in 1431, decreed that a general council is above the Pope; but the Lateran Council, in 1546, declared this decree to have been the source of corruption and abuse. The Council of Constantinople forbade the worship or reverence paid to images; the second Nicene Council enjoined it; the Council of Frankfort prohibited it; and it was finally re-established by the Council of Trent."—BP. BLOMFIELD'S *Letter to Mr. Butler,* p. 21.

From many texts of scripture, in which the true Church of Christ is always represented as a numerous congregation spread through the world. Gen. xxii. 18. "In thy seed shall all the nations of the earth be blessed." Ps. ii. 8. "Ask of me, and I will give thee the heathens for thine inheritance; and the uttermost parts of the earth for thy possession." Ps. xxii. 27. "All the ends of the world shall remember and turn unto the Lord, and all the kindreds of the nations shall worship before thee." Isa. xlix. 6. "It is a light thing that thou shouldst be my servant to raise up the tribes of Jacob—I will also give thee for a light to the Gentiles, that thou mayest be my salvation unto the end of the earth." Isa. liv. 1, 2, 3. "Sing, O barren thou that didst not bear, break forth into singing, and cry aloud thou that didst not travail with child; for more are the children of the desolate, than the children of the married wife, saith the Lord. Enlarge the place of thy tent, and let them stretch forth the curtains of thine habitation: spare not, lengthen thy cords and strengthen thy stakes: for thou shalt break forth on the right hand and on the left; and thy seed shall inherit the Gentiles, &c." Malachi i. 11. "From the rising of the sun even to the going down of the same, my name shall be great among the Gentiles." See Isa. ii. 2, 3; Micah iv. 1, 2; Daniel ii. 31, &c.

"That the Church of Christ is Catholic or universal," we readily admit; but protest against the *Popish* Church so calling herself, whilst so many of her own doctrines are arrayed against those of true Christianity. Protestants pray every day for the *Catholic Church* in their liturgy; but *Roman* Catholic or Papist are synonimous terms, which distinguish that class from every denomination of Christians whatsoever. We will show, presently, how they came to be so called, and how their Church obtained that portion of *universality* she possesses; but we must, in accordance with our plan, first notice the "scriptural proofs" adduced in support of the claim.

Until the third question, we are referred by retrogression to what the Pope had already told us in the first and third sections; and to which our readers can turn if they please. We then come to a line extracted from Genesis:—"In thy seed shall all the nations of the earth be blessed." We cannot see how this blessing to Abraham has anything to do

with Popery; but think we *can* perceive a systematic disinclination to give any *cause*, as stated by the prophets, for the peculiar favours of GOD towards his people: and this, it naturally strikes us, arises on the part of the Romish Church, from the *caution* necessary to preserve her very existence; since, were she to state the reasons and conditions assigned and commanded, it would place her own practice in direct contrast with the commands of the SUPREME. Thus, (as will be proved) when Popes were heading armies and excommunicating each other, as they were opposed to the Gospel of Christ, and as it would not be for the interest of their Churches to touch upon such *unpleasant* subjects, so would it appear contrary to Popish practice, to give the reasons and conditions assigned for GOD's promised grace. When the ALMIGHTY made the promise to Abraham, he added, "*because thou hast obeyed my voice.*" The Pope, no doubt, had his own cogent reasons for omitting the latter part of the verse. The next text applied (Ps. ii. 8.) tells of the Kingdom of Christ, *but not of a Pope*—although the inferences of the latter, in respect to his title to "the heathens for HIS *inheritance;* and the *uttermost parts of the earth* for HIS *possession;*" and, (Psa. xii. 27.) that "*all the kindreds of the nations*" *ought* to *worship* HIM, are too flimsy to be mistaken. The passage from Isaiah (xlix. 6.) is also a promise of CHRIST—*not* of a Pope; as are the other texts. What these extracts have to do with the "universality" of the Church of Rome, we really cannot imagine.

We have already said, that there can be no dispute among Christians as to the universality of the Church of CHRIST; and we have proved, according to CHRIST's own word, that this Church is always to be distinguished by her "good works." The Pope, however, without hesitation, declares that *his* is the Church promised in the Old Testament; and, as he has thought fit to call her the "*Mother and Mistress*

*of all Churches**," it may not here be deemed improper to give some account of her from her commencement. FACT is the surest test to try the pretensions of assertion; and the frame and government of the Church of Rome is a *fact* to be determined,—not by the bare assertions of Popes and Bishops,—but by histories and records.

To commence with the "Mother Church:"—Notwithstanding the positive assurances of the Papists, that their Church is the "Mother and Mistress of all Churches," we as positively declare that she is not so. We speak thus, upon the present occasion, to show the folly of unsubstantiated assertion: without proof on either side, our own, or the assertions of any other person, would be entitled to as great credence as the Pope's. But we contend that the Church of *Jerusalem* was the *Mother* Church; and for which we have our SAVIOUR'S own words. (Luke xxiv. 47.) In that city, Christ himself first planted the Gospel; and commanded that, from thence, it should be preached to all nations, "*beginning at Jerusalem.*" The Apostles travelled, "preaching the word unto none but the Jews, only." (Acts xi. 19.) So that the *Jewish Christian* Church was, for some time, the *only* Church of CHRIST;—she it was who converted the Gentile nations; and who was, therefore, the mother, or first of them all. But we defy our Popish friends to show us any *scriptural authority* in support of Rome being the first *Gentile* Church; since "the disciples were called Christians *first in Antioch.*" (Acts xi. 26.) The *Greek* Church was before the *Latin;* and the New Testament was originally written in Greek, for its use. Are the Roman Catholic clergy prepared to prove that their Church was *Catholic* before there was a Christian in Rome? If not, how came the appellation to have been *transferred to* her *from* some *other* Church? St. John speaks (Rev. ch. i.) of

* See chap. xi.

"*the* seven Churches of Asia," but makes no allusion to the Church of Rome, unless *Babylon* the Great (Rev. xvii. 5.) be so interpreted. The Gentile Churches are often mentioned; but nothing is said of the "Church of Rome" either as existing or promised! With the authentic history of the Acts of the Apostles to refer to, were Papists not prohibited from reading the Scriptures, they would soon perceive the danger of relying for their salvation upon men not even alluded to in those "Acts," rather than upon CHRIST HIMSELF.

In the first age of Christianity the Apostle Paul informs us (1 Tim. ch. iii. and v.) to whose guidance the Church of CHRIST was to be entrusted, and whom he names as *Bishops*, *Deacons*, and *Elders*. Societies of pious Christians met; forms of prayer were introduced; and, as they related to the administration of the Lord's Supper, and in many other instances* corresponding with our own; bishops were appointed by the Apostles as their immediate successors, over the presbyters, or elders, to prevent any confusion arising from a perfect equality; and in every city† a bishop was to preside.

We have already shown, by Christ's own word, what good qualities he desired should be cultivated by the members of his Church, the "faith and good works" of which were to distinguish her from all others. But before we proceed farther in showing how vain is the assumption of the *Romish* Church in this respect, and that our readers may not be led into an erroneous supposition that CHRIST'S Church was not established until the appointment of bishops, &c. it may be proper to state that those meetings were called HIS Churches wherever a few sincere Christians assembled in his name. Thus Paul, in his 1st Epistle to the Corinthians, says,

* See Cave's Prim. Christ. vol. i. c. 11. Also Chillingworth's Safe Way, &c. p. 321. Lond. 1674.

† Titus i. 5.

(ch. xvi. ver. 19.) "The Churches of Asia salute you; Aquila and Priscilla salute you much in the Lord, *with the Church that is in their house.*" This authority of St. Paul will, we trust, be as well received by Roman Catholics as though it came from the Pope and all his cardinals? The writings of the New Testament were sent to the respective Christian Churches, each of which sent copies to the rest; and, in general, at the conclusion of the Epistles, it is stated by what hands they were conveyed. Thus, when Paul addressed the Romans from Corinth, he added, "*Sent* by Phœbe, servant of the Church at Cenchrea." Nothing could have been better arranged for the preservation of these scriptural truths in their original purity than the plan he recommended of exchanging copies of them:—"And when this Epistle is read amongst you, cause that it be read also in the church of the Laodiceans; and that ye likewise read the Epistle from Laodicea." "*Col.* iv. 16." And thus, when spurious Epistles were forged by heretics, they were at once detected, as they could not produce the *originals* from whence they said their *copies* were taken.

The three first Gospels were approved by John*, who did not write his own until more than fifty years after Matthew's had gone forth among the Christians; or about the year 99 of the vulgar era, and after the taking of Jerusalem by Titus†. The chief parts of the New Testament were received in the Church in the beginning of the second century ‡; and the canonical books finally arranged before the council of Laodicea, which took place towards the end of the fourth §. By the writings of the Apostles themselves we learn that "wolves in sheep's clothing" had crept in among their flocks; yet by the unremitting exertions of the primitive fathers, "the word

* St. John had seen the three first Gospels, for he wrote his own as a supplement to them.—*Jortin's Rem. on Eccl. Hist.* vol. i. p. 46.

† See Townson's Discourses, p. 109.

‡ *Mosheim, Eng. Trans.* vol. i. p. 108.

§ *Lardner*, vol. vi. p. 29. (8vo.)

of the righteous" increased in despite of heresy and persecution; and which, during the two first centuries, was chiefly propagated from the Euphrates to the Ionian Sea *. To Rome, however, persons who were either guilty or suspected of being so, hastened, as they might, there, "in the obscurity of that immense capital†," evade the law. Of the Roman Empire, the more especially under the circumstances stated, it is but natural to imagine the metropolitan church was the most populous; and "in the middle of the third century (and after a peace of thirty-eight years) its clergy consisted of a bishop, forty-six presbyters, seven deacons, as many sub-deacons, forty-two acolythes, and fifty readers, exorcists, and porters ‡." The Emperor Constantine commenced his reign in the beginning of the succeeding age; and as he was the first monarch who had professed and encouraged the doctrines of Christianity, Rome soon became more important both in her clerical and secular influence.

After the first general council of Nice, which assembled about the year 325, the bishops began to entertain different notions with respect to church authority from "the mild and equal constitution by which the Christians were governed for more than a hundred years after the death of the Apostles§." "The primitive bishops were considered only as the first of their equals, and the honourable servants of a free people ||." But now the correspondence with the provincial synods, which had been the strength of "the union of the Church," was superseded by councils,—bishops soon distinguished themselves from deacons and elders; and attacking the original rights of clergy and people, their language of exhortation was changed into an expression of command ¶." The first breach thus created in the primitive discipline of the church was followed by aiming at pre-eminence among the bishops them-

* See Gibbon's Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire, vol. ii. p. 359.
† Ibid. ‡ Ibid. § Ibid. p. 333.
|| Ibid. p. 334. ¶ Ibid. p. 335.

selves; each of whom appeared anxiously bent upon increasing the importance of his own power and jurisdiction; and the Roman Church being the most considerable of the West, on the supposition that St. Peter *might* have been a bishop of that see, it was readily asserted as a positive fact that he was so, although we cannot find in the *Scriptures* that he was ever at Rome at all*. And even the ancient writers who speak of his having suffered martyrdom in that city, relate that he arrived there in the reign of Nero, and but a short period before his sufferings and death. But whether St. Peter was ever at Rome or not, he never wrote to the Romans, as did Paul; but it well answered the purpose of the Romish Church to insist upon it, although we defy any Popish priest of the present day to prove, *by the Scriptures*, that he had anything whatever to do with Rome.

Although "† the hard necessity of censuring either a Pope or a saint and martyr distresses the modern Roman Catholics whenever they are obliged to relate the particulars of a dispute, in which the champions of religion indulged such passions as seem much more adapted either to the senate or the camp," yet why this should be the case we know not, otherwise than from a *fear* of the truth; but TRUTH being our object, we certainly feel no such fastidious qualms. Constantine had removed the seat of his empire from Rome to Byzantium, from him since called Constantinople. Still, the see of Rome had obtained and kept the precedence of all others in the empire, amidst constant and *mutual* excommunications between her bishops and those of other churches, who denied her right of encroachment upon their privileges and institutions. Until the council of *Chalcedon*, about 450 years after Christ, a

* On this subject see Bishop Bull's Vindication of the Church of England, p. 139; Burnet's History of the Reformation, vol. i. p. 175. Also Mosheim's Ecclesiastical History, vol. i. p. 264.

Eusebius (on the authority of Papius, a credulous writer) says, Peter *was* at Rome in the days of Claudius. *See Eveleigh's Serm.* p. 95.

† Gibbon's Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire, vol. ii. p. 343.

patriarch with jurisdiction over several *metropolitans*, or provinces, had never been heard of. Even then, the provinces, or countries over which they presided, maintained their own temporal privileges for some time after, as was the case with England; but the Asiatic and African churches were ultimately, by intrigue and the sword, merged into the see of Rome*. But the "*universal supremacy*" assumed by her Popes was not acknowledged until the commencement of the seventh century (about 606), when Boniface III. took upon him the privilege of becoming "infallible" and "supreme;" although towards the latter end of the preceding age, *John*, Bishop of Constantinople, (after the seat of empire was translated to that place,) took the liberty of trying the experiment of absolute authority over all his contemporary bishops.

This attempt of *John* was not attended with complete success, although his assumption may be styled the foundation of Popery†. Gregory, Bishop of Rome, afterward called the Great, wrote against John's new doctrine, which he denounced as a "*Luciferian pride*," asserting, that whoever should adopt it, would be the forerunner of *Antichrist;* declaring also, that if there were to be such a head of a church, the church must err with him‡. But Gregory's successors had not so humble an opinion of power and wealth as himself; Boniface made the most of the opportunity afforded him by *Phocas*, on the latter murdering his sovereign the Emperor

* The first attempt to exercise *any* species of undue authority in the Christian Church was made by Victor (A. D. 195), then Bishop of Rome, in opposition to Polycarp (who succeeded Bucolus in the bishopric of Smyrna, and was consecrated by St. John the Evangelist), and the other heads of the Asiatic churches, relative to fixing the day for the celebration of Easter; Victor excommunicating *all the churches* which dissented from *his* opinion. For this insolent assumption he was condemned by all the other bishops; and Irenæus, in the name of the bishops of France, in censuring Victor, reminded him of the vast difference of his thus breaking the union of the Church to the peace and unity of Christian love. See *Euseb.* l. 5. c. 24.

† In the seventh century the bishops of Rome "received the pompous titles of *Masters of the World*, and *Popes*, i. e. universal fathers." Mosh. vol. ii. p. 146. Eng. trans.

‡ Registrum, Lib. ii. Epist. 32. 36. 38. Lib. vii. Epist. 30. 36, &c.

Mauritius, and seizing the throne : in this deed of blood he was abetted by Boniface, who owned him as his prince; and Phocas, in return, acknowledged the supremacy of Boniface over all other bishops. Thus was the despotism of the Church of Rome established in the seventh century; and such the alteration in the *government* and *unity* of the Christian Church, from that which was ordained by CHRIST himself—preached by his apostles—and persevered in during the first ages of the primitive fathers and other good men. Thus did the Church of Rome usurp the name of *Catholic* whose badge of *unity* is subserviency to her bishop; and thus having wrested their just rights from the whole christian world, she maintained them *pro viribus*, until her superstitions rendered her victims defenceless. These facts are matters of history—let those who would deny them *prove* their incorrectness. The apostles speak often of christian *churches* (all under CHRIST as their head;)—which of the churches headed by the Pope was *Catholic*, in the ninth, tenth, and eleventh ages, when these *infallible* saints were butchering the people and each other*; and when *Benedict IX.*, *John XIX.*, and *Sylvester III.* were Popes of Rome *at the same time*, *besides John Gratian*, who was a *fourth* aspirant, and ultimately succeeded as Gregory VI. What says Dupin on this subject? "It is true that, *at present*, the name of the Church of Rome is given to the Catholic Church, and that these two terms *pass* for synonymous. But in *antiquity*, no more was intended by the name of the Church of Rome,

* From the ninth to the thirteenth centuries, there cannot be found in history such horrible atrocities as those which disgraced the Papacy. "There was a succession of not less than fifty bishops" (of Rome) says Stillingfleet, "so remarkable for their wickedness, that Annas and Caiphas (setting only aside their condemning Christ) were *saints in comparison of them.*"

"For one hundred and fifty years together, out of fifty Popes, scarcely *one* can be found who was not notorious for wickedness," says Townsend. See also Tillotson's Rule of Faith, p. 718—722. Baronius calls these the Iron and Leaden Ages; and owns, that by the crimes of *his* "Church," it seemed as though Christ had slept, and that there were none of his disciples to cry to him. See also Platina, Luitprand, (who wrote in the tenth century,) &c. &c. &c.

than the church of the *city of Rome*, and the Popes in their subscriptions, or superscriptions, took simply the quality of *bishops of Rome*," &c. *Traité de la puissance Ecclésiastique, &c. page* 551.

SECT. V.—*That the Church of Christ must be* apostolical, *by a succession of her pastors and a lawful mission derived from the apostles.*

How do you prove this?

1st. Because only those who can derive their lineage from the apostles are the heirs of the apostles; and consequently they alone can claim a right to the scriptures, to the administration of the sacraments, or any share in the pastoral ministry: it is their proper inheritance, which they have received from the apostles, and the apostles from Christ. "As my Father hath sent me, even so I send you." John xx. 21.

2dly. Because Christ promised to the apostles and their successors, "that he would be with them always even to the end of the world," Matt. xxviii. 20, and that the Holy Ghost, "the spirit of truth, should abide with them for ever," John xiv. 16, 17.

To this section, as but little of scripture could be found by the Pope bearing upon the question, we need quote but little of the sacred volume, to shew the misapplication of the two or three lines referred to.

The first of these lines is spoken by Christ to his apostles, at the time he *breathed* upon, and imparted to them the Holy Ghost. Secondly, that CHRIST said he would be with them to the end of the world; and thirdly, that "the Spirit of Truth should abide with them for ever." Upon these grounds the Pope claims the inheritance of the apostles, his or his Church's right thereto being derived in a direct lineage from them. Of this "inheritance" we will say but few words. If the Pope or his bishops will shew us any portion of scripture which will *warrant their title* in opposition to the texts we have already quoted, in refutation of so palpable an assumption, it will be quite time enough to admit it. When CHRIST *breathed* upon the apostles, it was at Jerusalem, nor in the *scriptures* do we find any allusion to

Rome or its Pope; but we are taught by these scriptures, that the ministers who serve God are God's ministers. As to the "*lineage derived* from the apostles," we scarcely understand the allusion*. Popes are *elected*, and have been since the time of Alexander III.†, from cardinals when they do not *fight* for their infallibility; and we have always seen, according to history, that the strongest interest of either kind has obtained it. Who but the strongest party was of this "*lineage*," when Popes were slaying each other? or when in the sixth œcumenical, or general, council, Pope Honorius was solemnly condemned for *heresy*, A. D. 680? But as the 14th and 16th verses of John, chap. xvi. are quoted, why, we ask, was the intermediate verse omitted? It consists but of seven words, is spoken by CHRIST himself, and runs thus: *if you love me keep my commandments*. But the Pope and Dr. Challoner both seem to have thought that this sentence was not the *most* applicable to prove the "inheritance" of Popery from the apostles.

---

* It is evident that the *Salic* law is unnecessary to preserve Popish infallibility, since *Popesses*, or lady-popes, are no interruption to this "*direct lineage*;" and as great ability has been evinced under the Papal and petticoat-government of Pope *Joan*, when the tiara graced *her* fair brow, it shews a great want of gallantry in her successors, that she was not sainted *pro forma*. Leo IVth dying A. D. 855, *Joan* a learned lady (admitted on all sides to have possessed much genius and dexterity) made her best curtsey from the Papal chair, in which she contrived to sit unmolested for two years, (a much longer period than many others have kept it) when Benedict the Third became the luminary of the "*direct lineage*." The ecclesiastical writers of the five succeeding ages never dreamed of denying the fact, so notorious in itself; and which could not in anywise derogate from the dignity or credibility of an "*infallible*" church. Thus the fact was handed down to posterity, by the same pens that recorded other pontificates, and was undisputed until the commencement of the Lutheran Reformation. *Then* it was that the Popish writers first determined to insist upon it, that all their predecessors who had written of Pope *Joan* were all wrong—that Joan was not a woman, or if she *was* a woman, she could not have reigned; whilst others thought it best to insist that (notwithstanding the account is transmitted to us by their own *infallible* guides) there never was such a person at all. Those who would peruse the authorities (readily believed by Papists themselves in *other* points) in proof of the correctness of the above statement, are referred to the *Exercitatio de Papa Fœmina*, tom. ii. of Spanheim, in which they are collected; or L'Enfant's translation of it into French.

† In the third council of the Lateran held at Rome, A. D. 1179, in which it was decreed that the election of a Roman pontiff should be vested in the cardinals *only*, two thirds of whose number should decide it. This decree still exists.

SECT. VI.—*That* Catholics, *and not* Protestants, *are the true Church of Christ.*

How do you prove that the Catholic Church, in communion with Rome, is the true Church of Christ, rather than Protestants or other sectaries.

From what has been already said in the foregoing sections; for, 1st. The true Church of Christ can be no other than that which has always had a visible being in the world ever since Christ's time, as we have seen, Sect. I. She was founded by Christ himself, with the express promise "that the gates of hell should not prevail against her." Matt. xvi. 18. "She is the kingdom of Christ, which shall never be destroyed." Dan. ii. 44. Therefore the true Church of Christ can be no other than the *Catholic*, which alone has always had a visible being in the world ever since Christ's time. Not the *Protestant*, nor any other modern sect, which only came into the world since the year 1500. For those who came into the world 1500 years after Christ, came into the world 1500 years too late to be the religion or Church of Christ.

2ndly, The true Church of Christ, in virtue of the promises both of the Old and New Testament, was to continue pure and holy in her doctrine and terms of communion in all ages, even to the end of the world, as we have seen, Sect. III., and, consequently, could never stand in need of a *Protestant* reformation: therefore that which was of old the true Church of Christ must still be so, and it is in vain to seek for the true church among any of the sects of pretenders to reformation; because they all build upon a wrong foundation, that is, upon the supposition that the Church of Christ was for many ages gone astray.

3dly, The true Church of Christ must be Catholic, or Universal; she must not only be the church of all ages, but also more or less the church of all nations, as we have seen, Sect. IV. She must be *Apostolical*, by a succession and mission derived from the apostles, as we have also seen, Sect. V. Now these characters cannot agree to any of our modern sects, but only to the old religion, which alone is the church of all ages, and more or less of all nations; and which descends in an uninterrupted succession, continued in the same communion, from the apostles down to these our days. Therefore the old religion alone is the true Church of Christ, which can be but one, and in one communion, as we have seen, Sect. II.

As Protestants*, we *protest* against the pitiful shifts of

* This appellation, now generally applied to all Christians who deny the superstitious doctrines of Popery, &c. originated thus:—In the year 1526, Popery had determined, as Mosheim expresses it, "to suppress, by force, a doctrine which she was incapable of overturning by argument;" against which suppression the Lutherans guarded themselves in the best way they could, when the first diet of Spire (a

Popery throughout the whole of her doctrines, in assuming, self-evidently, false premises, from which Papists put forth the most absolute conclusions without one single scriptural *proof* to support them: we know, however, that *design* can supply its place by *sophistry* alone, and of which we think it cannot be deemed unfair (or, what is of more importance, it cannot be shown *untrue*) to assert that the present section is a tolerably good specimen of the rest.

That the Church of Christ is *Catholic* we have already admitted, but repeat our protest against the *Romish* Church so calling herself. We, nevertheless, are taught that it is our duty "to live in charity with all men;" nor do we envy those their hearts and minds who have introduced into the volume they profanely call "*Gospel*," a prohibition against the purest doctrines of CHRIST*. That the Popish Church is the true Church of Christ, we are told, is proved by a line of Scripture previously quoted, and *misquoted* here; because "*her*," we suppose, was deemed more expressive than "*it*:" of the propriety of its application, our readers may themselves judge. Of the quotation from Daniel ii. 44, "She is the kingdom of Christ, which shall never be destroyed," we will only make one remark—*there is no* SUCH *line to be found in the book of Daniel*†; and as the Pope could not

---

city of Germany) assembled, in which the Confederate Princes insisted upon their right of managing their own ecclesiastical affairs. During the three ensuing years the Reformation proceeded with rapid strides, when, A.D. 1529, a second diet was held at Spire, where the Princes entered into a solemn *protest* against the superstitions of the Romish Church; and hence the denomination of *Protestant*, adopted by all classes of Christians who wish to be distinguished as not being in a state of mental subserviency to Popes.

* "The *speeches, preachings*, and *writings* of PROTESTANTS are *pestiferous*, and *creeping, like a cancer;* and, *therefore*, never to be heard by CHRISTIAN MEN."—Rhemish Test. *On* 1 *Tim. ch. iii.* 12. *Republished in* 1816, *under the direction of the Irish Jesuits, approved by Dr. Troy and all the Irish prelates.*

† Speaking of his own Church, the Pope quotes Daniel, as above. Daniel is interpreting the dream of Nebuchadnezzar—the verse referred to (44) runs thus:—"And in the days of these kings shall the God of heaven set up a kingdom which shall never be destroyed; and the kingdom shall not be left to other people, but it shall break to pieces, and consume all these kingdoms, and it shall stand for ever." When Pius IVth composed his "Grounds of Faith," the Reformation had already caused Popery to *crack;* that she has since been broken to pieces and become the scoff of more enlightened ages, look *now* at her contemptible assumptions, without

find any other scriptural passage to twist to his purpose in the present section, without wasting a single comment on the text as he has quoted it, we recommend a comparison of it and that which he has *manufactured,* as above. We will now proceed in our reply to his own unscriptural assertions.

First, then, if a *new* religion came into the world 1500* years, or 15 years, after CHRIST, in itself contrary to that which was taught by our Saviour, in both cases it came into the world "too late to be the religion of the Church of Christ;" and as the doctrines of Popery, viz. *supremacy, infallibility, transubstantiation, worship of images, indulgences, &c. &c. &c.* were not in existence until several ages after the resurrection, and (as we shall prove) they were first opposed to Christianity by proud and inordinately-wicked men, we should be really at a loss to conceive how the reformation of abuses, as in the Protestant Church, could give offence, did we not know that their exposure, in all cases, creates implacable enemies in the perpetrators of them.

"The *true* Church of Christ" will ever be the Christian Church most pure in her doctrines; let the Roman Catholics read the Scriptures, and they will readily discover that, in

---

the means of drawing a sword, as formerly, to enforce them; whilst her curses have recoiled upon herself, and induce her greatest enemies to pity her wretched insanity.

* This allusion of the Pope is in excellent keeping with his other perversions of sacred and profane history. It is here implied that Christianity, as practised in the Reformed Church, was unheard of until the year 1500; but was neither he nor Dr. Challoner aware that it was taught and professed in Britain during the second century? The two great seminaries of pure Christian learning were at Bangor and Caerlion, in North and South Wales. Bishops Stillingfleet, Burgess, &c. have published authorities in proof of St. Paul planting the Gospel in this country; but, as the Scriptures do not speak of it (*a*), we will merely observe that, when, in the sixth century, Gregory the First sent Augustine over to convert the Saxons, he (Augustine) made demands on the Abbot of Bangor on behalf of the See of Rome, which the said Abbot thought too arrogant, and replied accordingly, that he owed the Bishop of Rome no submission, being himself under the authority of the Bishop of Caerlion upon Uske (*b*). All the Episcopal Churches were in communion with each other until the assumptions of Popery dissolved it. Tertullian says, "*Britannorum inaccessa Romanis loca, Christo Vero subdita.*"—*adversus Judæos, c. 7.*

(*a*) St. Paul says, the Gospel was *in all the world,* although he does not particularize Britain, which was a part of the (then) known world.—See Coloss. i. 6.

(*b*) *See Spelman's Concilia, page* 108.—Tertullian also says, in his apology to the magistrates of the Emperor Severus (and which, according to Mosheim, was A. D. 198), that Britain *had* (then) accepted Christianity.

the Protestant Reformed Church, there are *no doctrines but such as are sanctioned and recommended by the Gospel;* whereas, in the Romish Church, the doctrines of our Saviour have long been discarded for the errors of Popery. "The *true* Church of Christ" *appeals to the understanding*—the *Atheist* may be converted to its faith, but the *Bigot,* who has been taught to erect his hopes of salvation on the basis of Superstition—who has been taught to surrender the most exalted attribute of his nature (REASON) at the feet of Idolatry—such a one dare not listen to the internal workings of *conviction,* since, conscious of the victory, he shrinks affrighted at her power, and turns to the priest, who has misled him, a sincere penitent, for having, but an instant, yielded up the reins of prejudice to common sense. Can we then marvel whilst one class of Christians *protested* only against the *abuses* which an unchristian lust of spiritual and *secular* power had extended throughout their whole church, that those by whom they were committed should protest against a *reformation* of them?

As we have nothing to reply to in the third paragraph, we beg to ask a few questions. Instead of the Pope telling us that none but his Church "*can* be true," and that "she *must*" be so, &c. &c., would it not have been wiser (if he could have done so) to have shown us, by the Scriptures, *when* Peter went to Rome, how long he was *Pope,* and *whom he appointed* to take the supremacy, &c.? We can find nothing of the kind in the Scriptures. CHRIST says to his Apostles, "But be ye not called Rabbi, for *one* is your *master, even* Christ, and all ye are brethren; and call ye no man your *Father* upon earth, for one is your Father, which is in heaven. But he that is greatest among you shall be your servant," &c. (Matt. xxiii. 8, 9, 11.) This is the language of Scripture; let Papists read the whole chapter—it is written *against ambition;* and such *scriptural* proofs will best determine the purity of the

Pope's Church. But, as we have been told that "reformation came into the world too late," it may not be improper here to show that a "reformation" of Popish abuses had commenced at a somewhat earlier period than the Pope or Dr. Challoner has thought fit to notice; we will also show *what means* were adopted by the Church of Rome to crush an *innovation* so destructive of its influence. Had not the Pope nor the Doctor ever heard of such people as the *Waldenses* or the *Albigenses*, who were coolly murdered for their "Reformation," which commenced in the year 1160? However, as these gentlemen have not taken any notice of this great victory obtained over Protestantism by Popery, we will endeavour to give such of *their own* readers, who may peruse what we write, some little information on the subject. Of their *heresy*, Venema gives this account in his *Historia Ecclesiastica*—"They held the Holy Scriptures to be the only source of faith and religion, without regard to the authority of the Fathers, and of tradition; they held the entire faith according to all the articles of the Apostles' Creed. They rejected all the external rites of the dominant Church, excepting Baptism and the Lord's Supper, as temples, vestures, images, crosses, the religious worship of the holy relics, and the remaining sacraments; these they considered as inventions of Satan, and of the flesh, and full of superstition. They rejected purgatory, with masses for the dead, acknowledging only two terminations of the present state—heaven and hell. They admitted no indulgences, nor confessions of sin, with any of their consequences, excepting mutual confessions of the faithful for instruction and consolation. They held the sacraments of Baptism and the Eucharist only as signs, denying the corporal presence of Christ in the Eucharist. They held only three ecclesiastical orders—Bishops, Priests, and Deacons. They considered monasticism a putrid carcass, and vows the invention of men; and declared the marriage of the clergy to be lawful and necessary. Finally, they

pronounced the Roman Church the whore of Babylon, and denied obedience to the Pope and his authority over other churches; nor would admit that he had the power of either the civil or ecclesiastical sword." Such were the doctrines of "reformation" preached in 1160, and as we shall show from the best authorities, that none of the "*abuses*" were introduced into the Christian religion (thereby rendering it *unchristian*) until many ages after the Resurrection, it will be found more difficult to *prove*, than merely to *assert*, that those "who came into the world 1500 years after Christ, came into the world 1500 years too late" to restore to the church her PRIMITIVE sanctity of doctrine and discipline.

The Waldenses, whose religious professions we have quoted as above, were the followers of Peter Waldus, a native of Lyons; and who, for their hostility to Popery, were banished by the Papal authorities of France, and took refuge in Piedmont. The natives of Albi, in the province of Languedoc, professed the same, or a similar creed, to the Waldenses, and were esteemed as a people possessing more learning and intelligence than any other Christians of that age: their numbers rapidly increased as their professions of faith spread abroad; and the inhabitants of their immediate neighbourhood, disgusted with the vices of Popery, as they were exemplified in her ministers, became willing converts to the belief of the Albigenses; the "heresy" engendered by whose creed the Pope (*Innocent III.*) resolved to exterminate by the murder of all its professors. "*The preaching of a first Reformation*," says M. de Sismondi, "amongst the Provençals *was the occasion of the devastation of this beautiful country.*" Innocent III., in the year 1206, as Henault says, commenced his preparations for the work of blood; forgiveness of sins, with indulgences to commit more, were promised to all who joined this *holy* crusade, as it was called, by the Pope and his agents: of these, the Abbot of Citeaux, Arnold Amalric, (of the order of Bernardins,) was one of the

principal; another of these was Saint (*Saint!!!*) Dominic*, a Spaniard, who commenced the order of (St. Dominic) the *Inquisitors*, assisted by the *pious* efforts of St. Francis†.

About the year 1209-10 Massacre appears to have arrived at the height of her own sanguinary office:—

"The fixed population of Beziers did not, perhaps, exceed "15,000 persons; but all the inhabitants of the country, of "the open villages, and of the castles which had not been "judged capable of defence, had taken refuge in this city, "which was regarded as exceedingly strong; and even those "who had remained to guard the strong castles, had, for the "most part, sent their wives and children to Beziers. This "whole multitude, at the moment when the crusaders became "masters of the gates, took refuge in the churches; the "great cathedral of St. Nicaise contained the greater num-"ber: the Canons, clothed with their choral habits, sur-"rounded the altar, and sounded the bells as if to express "their prayers to the furious assailants; but these supplica-"tions of brass were as little heard as those of the human "voice. The bells ceased not to sound, till, of that immense "multitude which had taken refuge in the church, *the last* "*had been massacred!* Neither were those spared who had "sought an asylum in the other churches; 7000 dead bodies "were counted in that of the Magdalen alone. When the "crusaders had massacred *the last living creature* in Beziers, "and had pillaged the houses of all that they thought worth "carrying off, they set fire to the city, in every part at once, "and reduced it to a vast funeral pile. Not a house remained

* This monster, Dominic de Guzman, was born at Calaroga, in Old Castile, A. D. 1170, and was an Inquisitor of Languedoc, where he founded his order in 1215. He died in 1221, at Bologna, and was CANONIZED!!!

† Father Francis was also another agent of this Papal butcher in his work of blood, and coadjutor of Dominic, who, whilst the latter was engaged in the murders of Albi, (as Dr. Chandler expresses it) "battled it with the heretics of Italy." This is the "blessed St. Francis," whose piety Romanists thus distinguish—"Christ prayed, Francis prevailed!" See Bp. Hall, v. i. p. 279. (The blasphemy commencing with *nihil Christus fecit*, &c., we dare not repeat.) The *blessings* of this *saint* are, at this day, worn by many of our Irish Romanist fellow-subjects about their persons, to protect them from temptations of the devil, sickness, sudden death, &c.

"standing, not one human being alive. Historians differ as "to the number of victims. The Abbot of Citeaux, feeling "some shame for the butchery which he had ordered, in his "letter to Innocent III. reduces it to 15,000, others make it "amount to 60,000."

The persecutions of this devoted race continued without intermission until (with the exception of a few individuals who escaped) it was exterminated.

"The crusaders took possession of the castle of Minerva "the 22d of July, 1210; they entered, singing *Te Deum*, "and preceded by the cross and the standards of Montfort. "The heretics were, in the mean time, assembled, the men "in one house, the women in another, and there, on their "knees, and resigned to their fate, they prepared themselves, "by prayer, for the punishment which awaited them. The "Abbot, Guy de Vaux-Cernay, to fulfil the capitulation, "came, and began to preach to them the Roman Catholic "faith; but his auditors interrupted him by an unanimous "cry—'We will have none of your faith,' said they, 'we "have renounced the Church of Rome: your labour is in "vain; for neither death nor life will make us renounce the "opinions that we have embraced.' The Abbot of Vaux-"Cernay then passed to the assembly of the women; but he "found them as resolute, and more enthusiastic still in their "declarations. The Count of Montfort, in his turn, visited "both. Already he had piled up an enormous mass of dry "wood: '*Be converted to the Catholic faith*,' said he to the "assembled Albigenses, '*or ascend this pile*.' None were "shaken. They set fire to the pile, which covered the whole "square with a tremendous conflagration; and the heretics "were then conducted to the place. But violence was not "necessary to compel them to enter the flames; they volun-"tarily precipitated themselves into them, to the number of "more than 140, after having commended their souls to that "God in whose cause they suffered martyrdom. Three

" women only, forcibly retained by the noble Dame of Marly,
" mother of Bouchard, Lord of Montmorency, were saved
" from the flames; and terror and consternation succeeding to
" their enthusiastic fervour, they consented to be converted."

The following extract is illustrative of the *crime of charity* as taught in the Popish church:—

" Those who had committed so many crimes were not, for
" the greater part, bad men. They came from that part of
" Burgundy and northern France where crimes have always
" been rare, where long contentions, hatred, and vengeance
" are passions almost unknown, and where the unhappy are
" always sure to find compassion and aid. The crusaders
" themselves were always ready to afford each other proofs
" of generosity, of support, and compassion; but the heretics
" were, in their eyes, outcasts from the human race. Ac-
" customed to confide their consciences to their priests, to
" hear the orders of Rome as a voice from heaven, never
" to submit that which appertained to the faith to the judg-
" ment of Reason, they congratulated themselves on the
" horror they felt for the sectaries. The more zealous they
" were for the glory of God, the more ardently they laboured
" for the destruction of heretics, the better Christians they
" thought themselves. And if at any time they felt a move-
" ment of *pity* or terror whilst assisting at their punishment,
" they thought it a revolt of the flesh, which they *confessed*
" *at the tribunal of penitence; nor could they get quit of*
" *their remorse till their priests had given them absolution!*
" Wo to the men whose religion is completely perverted!
" All their most virtuous sentiments lead them astray. Their
" zeal is changed into ferocity. Their humility consigns
" them to the direction of the impostors who conduct them.
" Their very *charity* becomes *sanguinary;* they sacrifice
" those from whom they fear contagion, and they demand a
" baptism of blood, to save some elect to the Lord."

The monk of Vaux-Cernay, who was the Popish chronicler

of these Crusades, thus tells us, with much self-satisfaction, the "*joyous*" results of the capture of Lavaur:—

"Very soon they dragged out of the castle Aimery, "Lord of Montreal, and other knights, to the number of "eighty. The noble Count immediately ordered them to be "hanged upon the gallows; but as soon as Aimery, the "stoutest among them, was hanged, the gallows fell; for, in "their great haste, they had not well fixed it in the earth. "The Count, seeing that this would produce great delay, "ordered the rest to be massacred; and the pilgrims, receiv-"ing the order with the greatest avidity, very soon massacred "them all upon the spot. The lady of the castle, who "was sister to Aimery, and an execrable heretic, was, by the "Count's order, thrown into a pit, which was filled up with "stones; afterwards, our pilgrims collected the innumerable "heretics that the castle contained, *and burned them alive* "*with the utmost joy**."

Such were the means employed to stifle a "reformation" of the abuses of the Church of Rome in the thirteenth century; and, judging by these, is it harsh to suppose that such *would have been adopted* by Pope Pius IV. himself—the pious Pope, whose name is attached to the book we are commenting upon—if he had possessed the *power* of exterminating the *English* reformers of the abuses practised in his church? He, who, in 1564, the sixth year of the reign of Elizabeth, summoned the Council of Trent to complete its sittings, which our readers will perceive sanctions all the impious pretensions of the Romish see? As the Order of St. Dominic, or Inquisitors, had commenced in the thirteenth century, about the year 1550 the Inquisition was *established*, and in the first year after Elizabeth ascended the throne, (1559,) a general butchery of Protestants took place in France,

* History of the Crusades against the Albigenses, &c. &c., from the French of J. C. L. Sismondi, 1826.

Spain, &c., under the sanction of Pope Paul IV.; and Pius, who succeeded him, inherited also his hatred to the pure faith of Christianity—asserting the power of his Church over princes and their subjects. *These* facts are now also matters of history; but that our readers may feel convinced that the same *spirit* exists in the Romish Church at all times, where it has power to exercise it, we refer them to the authentic records of the reign of Charles IX. of France, where, (in Paris,) under the influence of Pope Gregory XIII., in 1572, on St. Batholomew's Day, 30,000 Protestants were massacred in cold blood; and the Pope, by his legate, Cardinal Ursin, gave, as usual, a plenary absolution to all who had assisted in it; medals were struck in commemoration of it, and a *jubilee* proclaimed to the Papists generally. Antony Muretus spoke an oration at Rome, in which he styles Gregory "*Blessed Father,*" as the chief instigator of the slaughter; Gregory thanked Charles for the service he had performed to the "true Church;" and De Gondi, the French ambassador at the English court, as Camden tells us, declared this massacre to be "a *remedy*" of the "true Church." We have exceeded our usual limit in making these authentic extracts, but, we trust, not ineffectually. Let us not again hear it said by the Romish Church, that no reformation was either necessary therein, or even heard of until 1500. Be it our task to show when she first avowed her numerous heretical doctrines in opposition to Christianity.

Chap. II.—Of Scripture and Tradition.

What is your belief concerning the Scriptures?

That it is to be received by all Christians as the infallible word of God.

Do you look upon the Scripture to be clear and plain in all points necessary; that is, in all such points wherein our salvation is so far concerned, that the misunderstanding and misinterpreting of it may endanger our eternal welfare?

No: because St. Peter assures us, 2 Pet. iii. 16, that in St. Paul's

epistles " there are some things hard to be understood, which they that are unlearned and unstable, wrest, as they do also the other Scriptures, to their own destruction."

How then is this danger to be avoided?

By taking the meaning and interpretation of the Scripture from the same hand from which we received the book itself, that is, from the Church?

Why may not every particular Christian have liberty to interpret the Scripture according to his own private judgment, without regard to the interpretation of the Church?

1st. Because " no prophecy of the scripture is of private interpretation," 2 Pet. i. 20. 2dly. Because as men's judgments are as different as their faces, such liberty as this must needs produce as many religions almost as men. 3dly. Because Christ has left his church and her pastors and teachers to be our guides, in all controversies relating to religion, and consequently in the understanding of holy writ. Ephes. iv. 11, 12, &c. " He gave some apostles, and some prophets, and some evangelists, and some pastors and teachers, for the perfecting of the saints, for the work of the ministry, for the edifying of the body of Christ, till we all come in the unity of the faith and of the knowledge of the Son of God unto a perfect man, unto the measure of the stature of the fulness of Christ. That we may henceforth be no more children tossed to and fro, and carried about with every wind of doctrine, by the slight of men and cunning craftiness, whereby they lie in wait to deceive; but, speaking the truth in love, may grow up into him in all things which is the head, even Christ." Hence St. John, in his first epistle, chap. iv. 6, gives us this rule for the trying of spirits: " He that knoweth God, heareth us," (the pastors of the church), " he that is not of God, heareth not us: by this we know the spirit of truth, and the spirit of error."

Why does the church, in her profession of faith, oblige her children never to take or interpret the scripture otherwise than according to the unanimous consent of the holy Fathers?

To arm them against danger of novelty and error. Prov. xxii. 28: " Remove not the ancient land-mark which thy fathers have set."

Were it not that the tenets of Popery teach men to reconcile the most palpable contradictions, it would seem strange that whilst the Scriptures are acknowledged to be the " *infallible word of God*," they should be withheld from general perusal by those who so profess to believe them, and who call themselves God's Vicegerents upon earth.—We are next told that these Scriptures are not clear in the points necessary to

salvation ; and St. Peter is quoted to prove, that those "who are unstable, wrest them to their own destruction," and again, to show that "no prophecy of the Scriptures is of private interpretation ;" a long passage follows from Paul's Epistle to the Ephesians, a brief extract from St. John, concluding with a line from Proverbs.

In the first place, as the Pope has not shown us any command of CHRIST, or his Apostles, that the Scriptures are *not* to be read—and as common sense would naturally imagine that they were bequeathed to mankind for that purpose—we will prove to Papists, that it is not only lawful but *obligatory* to read them. The chapter from which the extract from Peter is made, is an epistle on the certainty of CHRIST's coming to judgment; and of which, he says, Paul, in all his epistles, had apprised those to whom he addressed himself. But he does not tell them that they should *not read* the writings of Paul (which, in the very verse referred to he classes among the *other* Scriptures) ; and who but Papists will suppose he did not intend they should read the epistles he wrote himself? That the Scriptures are hard to be understood, as Popery has perverted them, we admit ; nor can there be a clearer proof of the way in which they may be "wrested" to particular purposes than as they appear before us in these passages selected by Pius IV., and of which the very next quotation is a positive proof.—When Peter says, "that no prophecy of the Scripture is of any private interpretation," is there one Popish priest so ignorant as not to know that it has no allusion to *reading* the gospel? Did not the Pope know that it alluded to the *gift of prophecy coming from God ;* without which (gift) no man could *interpret,* or foretel, HIS great designs? If the Pope did not so understand it, nor Dr. Challoner, they should have read the succeeding verse, which would have explained it to them : v. 21, "For the *prophecy came not* in old time by the will of man ; but holy men of God spake *as they were moved* by the Holy Ghost." What

is there necessary to salvation that the Scriptures do not teach, or what *can* be necessary to salvation that is not to be found therein? They would instruct their readers to trust in CHRIST, and to abandon Popery—and hence the cause why Popery forbids them to be read. Thank God, the days are past when the *crime* of teaching the Lord's prayer in our own country in *English* subjected him who was *guilty* of it to popish vengeance!—as was the case so lately as in the beginning of the reign of Henry VIII.*

As the next extract, "He gave some apostles, and some prophets, and some evangelists," &c. has not anything to do with the question of depriving the laity of the benefits and comforts of Scripture; and as we are not prepared to admit that the Popish clergy are either apostles, prophets, or evangelists, we refer our readers to the chapter quoted, wherein they will find that Paul says, "Let no *corrupt communication* proceed out of your mouth," &c. John (ch. iv. v. 3.) says, "that the *spirit* of *Anti-Christ* was *then* in the world," The extract, v. 6, is correct (*except* the "pastors of the Church"); but why not have given the two following verses? The 7th says, "*love* is of God;" and the 8th, "He that loveth not is not of God; for God is love." This Christian love is of a very different kind to that fervour which kindles the faggot and forces the victim on the rack. As to the proverb against removing the land-mark, any other proverb might, we think, as well have been taken by chance, and would have been as *properly* applied. The chapter treats of "a good name:" it contains (v. 8) this passage,—"He that soweth iniquity shall reap vanity, and the rod of his anger shall fail."

But we will now show that it is not only incumbent upon all Christians to read the Scriptures, but also to exercise *their*

* "If any taught their children the Lord's Prayer, the ten commandments, and the Apostles' Creed in the vulgar tongue, that was *crime* enough to bring them to the *stake*."—*Burnett's Hist. Ref.* vol. i. p. 31.

own judgment. Throughout the whole doctrine taught by Christ himself, he always refers the unbelievers to the Old Testament for proof of the prophecies concerning his own appearance and divine mission on earth, thus: "For it is written,"—"Have ye not read in the Scriptures," &c.; and we now, in the first place, appeal to the commonest understanding, if it can be *voluntarily* imagined that our Saviour, who recommended a perusal of the old law, would forbid the publication or the reading of HIS OWN WORDS and ACTIONS? Upon this single point we shall be somewhat more copious in our scriptural extracts than usual; since, would the Romish clergy but allow the Scriptures to be generally read by their followers, as they have been handed down to us—i. e. *without* any *additions, subtractions,* and *interpolations of their own,* sure we are (and so are their *priests* also) that the impurities which disfigure their worship, in direct opposition to Christianity, would very soon be dispelled as a vapour by the sun.

We will commence with a few quotations from the Old Testament, for the purpose of proving to such Romanists as may be induced to peruse these pages, that the prophets taught the necessity of publishing the old law to the people, generally, as did Christ and his apostles command the diffusion of the New*.

Deut. xi. 18. "Therefore, shall ye lay up these my words in your heart and in your soul," &c.

—— — 19. "And ye shall teach them your children, speaking of them when thou sittest in thine house," &c.

Josh. viii. 34. "And afterwards *he read all the words of the law,*" &c.

—— — 35. "There was *not a word* of all that Moses

* When Christ foretold the destruction of the Temple of Jerusalem and the persecutions of his Apostles, the latter asked him when these things should be? To whom he replied (Mark xiii. ver. 10), "*The Gospel must first be published among all nations,*" *i. e.* to all the nations of the then known world.

commanded which Joshua *read not before all the congregation* of Israel, with the women and the little ones, and the strangers that were conversant among them."

Isaiah viii. 20. "To the law and to the testimony, if they speak not according to *this word*, it is because there is no light in them."

These few brief extracts from innumerable others which might be quoted, of similar import, are sufficient to prove that the Jewish priests were not to make the old law subservient to their own purposes. We will now show that the Popish Church is opposed to the Scriptures, and therefore unholy in her doctrine in prohibiting the laity from receiving the inestimable blessings conferred by the instruction of the Gospel.

John, ch. v. 39. "*Search the Scriptures*, for in them ye think ye have eternal life, and they are they which testify of me."

2d Timothy, ch. iii. v. 13, 14, 15. "But evil men and seducers shall wax worse and worse, *deceiving and being deceived;* but continue thou in the things thou hast learned and hast been assured of, knowing of whom thou hast learned them, and that, *from a child, thou hast known the Holy Scriptures, which are able to make thee wise unto salvation, through faith which is in Jesus Christ.*"

Gal. ch. vi. v. 4. "But let every man *prove his own work*, and then shall he have rejoicing in himself alone and not in another."

Matt. ch. vii. v. 7. "Ask and it shall be given to you; seek and ye shall find; knock and it shall be opened unto you."

2d Cor. ch. xiii. v. 5. "*Examine yourselves* whether ye be in the faith; *prove your own selves.*"

Acts, ch. xvii. v. 11. "These [the men of Berea] were more noble than those of Thessalonica, in that they received

the word with more readiness of mind, and *searched the Scriptures daily whether those things were so.*"

Luke, ch. xxiv. v. 45. "Then opened he their understanding, that they might *understand the Scriptures.*"

Thess. ch. v. v. 21. "*Prove all things;* hold fast by that which is good."

1st Ep. John, ch. i. v. 4. "Those things *write* we unto you, that your joy may be full."

Luke, ch. xii. v. 57. "Yea, and why even of yourselves *judge ye not what is right?*"

John xx. v. 31. "But these were *written* that ye might believe that Jesus is the Son of God, and that believing ye might have life through his name."

Are the above texts, we ask, "hard to be understood?" They are fairly quoted from many others equally applicable. If any of our Romish readers doubt, let them "search the Scriptures," and we will stand or fall by the fidelity or incorrectness of them. What "difference of judgment" could there be in the opinions of five hundred persons, so that they were not Papists, concerning the above passages of Scripture? —would any one of them say it was his conscientious belief that their purport was a command that the Scriptures were *not* to be read by those professing Christianity? We think not. Neither are we inclined to believe it "would produce as many religions almost as men*;" since Christ himself

* This assertion is equally unfortunate with all the others in support of the infallibility of a church the most variable and contradictory in its councils of any in the whole Christian world. The primitive bishops *wrote* to the Christians as the Apostles had done. Polycarp was a disciple of St. John the Evangelist, and *wrote* to the Philippians (*a*), &c. nor can we conceive to what purpose inspired and holy penmen wrote at all if they intended that their writings should be only *partially* read, *i. e.* by a comparatively few priests. When they addressed themselves to an *individual*, their writings are so distinguished (as Paul to Timothy, Titus, &c.), yet *these* Epistles were published under the inspection and approbation of St. John. Gregory, Basil, Antony, Benedict, &c. commend the reading of the Scriptures; a practice not publicly forbidden until the Council of Lateran (in the thirteenth century, under Innocent III.), and afterwards solemnly prohibited in the council of Trent. *See Stillingfleet's Council of Trent examined and disproved.*

(*a*) Mosheim says the genuineness of the Epistle (yet extant) is doubtful, and refers to Tillemont's Memoirs, &c.

says (Matthew, ch. xxii. v. 37, 39, 40), that "the first great commandment is to love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, with all thy soul, and with all thy mind; and the second is like unto it, thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself. On these two commandments *hang all the law and the prophets.*" Where is the Christian who by a perusal of the Scriptures would be induced to deny the truth of these commandments—is there *one* Roman Catholic who would do so? We say *No;* an *attentive* perusal of the Gospel is calculated but to make the infidel a Christian; and an indifferent Christian a much better man. We have already said, that if the Romanist were to be allowed by his priest—or if he chose to do so without such privilege, to read the sacred volume, it should be without interpolation, &c. since we must condemn the means adopted by Popery to instil into the minds of her admirers, principles, not only pernicious, but as revolting to human nature as they are destructive to the immortal soul. At the conclusion of the Appendix to the work we are treating of, there is a note which we will insert here: it runs thus:—

"N.B.—That in the foregoing sheets, in quoting the Scriptures, we have followed the common *Protestant Bible* for the sake of a great part of our readers that may have been accustomed to it: not designing thereby to declare our approbation of that version, much less to give it the preference to our *Catholic, Rhemish,* and *Douay* translations."

Now, as we have already shown, upon the authority of the Pope, that his laity are not to read the Scriptures otherwise than his priests may think proper to interpret them, we must confess (publicly) that we cannot guess who are "the great part of his readers" alluded to who may have read the *Protestant Bible*—certainly not the priests themselves, since they would also prefer the *Rhemish,* &c. translations. We have just referred to one of these, from which we have taken a few extracts, and which we here offer to the serious attention of our readers, reminding them that this Rheims Testament is

preferred by the Romish clergy—whether or not for the pure charity of its Annotations we will not pretend to say. From these we extract the following:—

Note on Heb. v. v. 7. "That the translators of the English Protestant Bible ought to be abhorred to the depths of hell."

Note on Gal. i. 8. "*Christians* should have such zeal towards all *Protestants* and their doctrines, though never so dear to them, as to give them the anathema, nor spare even their own parents."

Luke ix. v. 55. "As the fate of Elias was not reprehended, neither is the Church nor Christian princes blamed by God for putting heretics to death."

Note on Heb. xiii. v. 16; and Rev. xvii. v. 7. "When Rome puts heretics to death, and allows their punishment in other countries, their blood is no more than that of thieves or man-killers."

John x. v. 1; and Heb. v. v. 1. "All Protestant clergy are thieves and ministers of the devil."

Note on Rev. xi. v. 6, 20. "Christian people, bishops especially, should have great zeal against heretics and hate them, even as God hateth them; and be thus zealous against all false prophets and heretics of what sort soever, after the example of holy Elias, that in zeal killed 450 false prophets."

Without entering into an inquiry of the virtues of the respective Popish Saints whose sentiments we have recorded above, it is quite sufficient for Protestants to know that such *are* the sentiments of *pure* Popery; many thousands who *call* themselves Roman Catholics—(since *good* Romanists must not object to anything recommended by their "church")—have objected to them*, and thousands more know not

* On the 17th of March, Resolutions, signed by 375 Roman Catholic Teachers, &c., expressive of the wishes of 5000 grown up people, were presented by the Schoolmasters of the Kings-court district to the Irish Bible Society, declaring the Scriptures supplied to them by that Society, in their native language, to be "the greatest boon Ireland had ever received;" and which they could not "give up," &c. The consequence of

that they *ought* to believe in them :—of a *clergy* who *do* so we will only say, it is not to be wondered at that they "*prefer*" the book which contains them.

SECT. II.—*Of apostolical and ecclesiastical traditions.*

What do you mean by apostolical traditions?

All such points of faith or church discipline which were taught or established by the apostles, and have carefully been preserved in the church ever since.

What difference is there between apostolical and ecclesiastical traditions?

The difference is this, that *Apostolical traditions* are those which had their origin or institution from the apostles: such as infant baptism, the Lord's Day, receiving the sacrament, fasting, &c. *Ecclesiastical traditions* are such as had their institution from the Church, as holidays and fasts ordained by the church.

How are we to know what traditions are truly apostolical and what not?

In the same manner and by the same authority by which we know what scriptures are apostolical, and what are not: that is, by the authority of the Apostolic Church, guided by the unerring Spirit of God.

But why should not the scripture alone be the rule of our faith, without having recourse to apostolical traditions?

1. Because, without the help of apostolical tradition, we cannot so much as tell what is scripture and what is not. 2. Because Infant Baptism and several other necessary articles are either not at all contained in scripture, or at least are not plain in the scripture without the help of tradition.

What scripture can you bring in favour of tradition?

"Therefore brethren stand fast, and hold the tradition, which ye have been taught, whether by word or our epistle," 2 Thess. ii. 15. "Ask thy father, and he will show thee, thy elders, and they will tell thee," Deut. xxxii. 7. See Psalm xix. 5, 6, 7. 1 Cor. xi. 2. 2 Thess. iii. 6. 2 Tim. i. 13., ch. ii. 2., ch. iii. 14.

The doctrine of salvation through faith in Christ, as taught by Him and his Apostles, was *written* by the Apostles and Evangelists, who also *baptized*. Christ himself says, (Matt. xviii. v. 5,) "Whoso shall receive one such little child in my name, receiveth me." And (Matt. xxviii. 19)

---

this was, that the Roman Catholic clergy obliged all the poor schoolmasters, where they had sufficient influence to do so, to "give up" *their schools!*—And, no wonder—the fourth Resolve declared "*notes or comments* not essentially necessary for understanding the *morality* and *plain truths of the Gospel*."

"Go ye therefore and teach all nations, *baptizing* in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost." God commanded that "the seventh day is the sabbath;" (Exod. xx. 8) but Christ afterwards sanctified the *first* day (Sunday) by rising from the dead, thus completing the work of Redemption thereon—(Mark xvi. 9)—by afterwards appearing to his disciples on that day, (John xx. 19) and sending down the Holy Ghost. In the Pope's ecclesiastical traditions we have but little faith, and for two reasons:—first, they are opposed *by* the Scriptures; secondly, *to* the Scriptures they are directly opposed.

"All Scripture," says St. Paul, (2 Tim. iii. 16) is given by inspiration of God, and *is profitable for doctrine*, for *reproof;* for *correction;* for *instruction* in *righteousness*." Of *traditions* Christ himself says—

Mark vii. 7. "Howbeit in vain do they worship me, teaching for doctrines the *commandments of men*."

8. "For laying aside the commandment of God, ye hold the *tradition of men*," &c.

9. "Full well ye reject the commandment of God that ye may keep *your own tradition*."

It would be unnecessary were we to give further proofs of *traditions*, when opposed to the Scriptures as are the Popish legends, being "corrupt and unprofitable," condemned as they are throughout by Christ and his Apostles: and the less necessity is there for our doing so, as already observed, since we shall pay particular attention to each of these traditional dogmas as they occur. In the third paragraph of the present section—as in all other cases where there can be no scriptural *allusion* even found to give the least colour to assertion—we are again told that the conflicting testimonies* of ambitious men all proceed from "the

* Arminianism was the doctrine of the Jesuits; Calvinism of the Jansenists; Quakerism of the Franciscans; Socinianism, in all its gradations, from Arianism to

unerring spirit of God!"—Sure we are the spirit of Impiety could alone induce hypocrites to put forth such wickedness, and which the spirit of Bigotry could alone induce Superstition to believe.

In the first section of the present chapter, the Pope admits the Scriptures to be "the infallible word of God;" but yet, as there is no allusion therein to the Pope himself, (unless as the Antichrist of the Revelations) he is compelled to set up an infallibility of his own, in which his followers *must* believe, to obtain (as they are taught) salvation. Now, we would ask why do Papists profess to believe in the Scriptures at all?—From a conviction of their genuineness and authenticity?—No such thing, since they are forbidden to peruse them; they, without reading them, believe, or profess to believe in them, because their "Church" bids them to do so; and they believe in the infallibility of their "Church," because their "Church" tells them that the Scriptures tell *her* she *is* infallible!—Such is the frail tenure by which the Roman Catholic adheres to his God—and as a God has popery been long worshipped by her idolators*, whilst trampling on the necks of the Kings of the earth †!

The allusion to "apostolical traditions," may be very convincing to those Papists who are not permitted to make a further enquiry. Their learned men (whom, we must not forget, never sought to *extend* their knowledge to "the people") well know that the books of the Old Testament, which we call apocryphal, were not admitted into the Jewish

Belshamism, was taught by the authors named in the *Roma Racoviana*. *See Townsend's Accus. of Hist.*, &c.—"The Romish Church has, notwithstanding its boasted uniformity of doctrine, been *always divided by a multitude of controversies.*" —*Mosh.* v. iii. p. 532. *Eng. Trans.*

* Pope Constantine I. incited Justinian to attack and destroy Ravenna (an independent bishopric which had refused to submit to the Pope), and put out the eyes of Felix, the bishop. The Emperor having met the Pope at Nicomedia, gave to the world the first example of kissing the pontiff's foot.—*Townsend's Accus of Hist.* &c., p. 80.

† Pope Alexander III., after Frederick Barbarossa was excommunicated and deposed, placed his foot upon the prostrate Emperor's neck and said, "Thou shalt tread upon the lion and adder. The young lion and the dragon shalt thou trample under feet."—Thus Popery has ever applied Scripture to her unscriptural purposes.

canon*; and from the Jews we received it, who must have been the best informed upon the subject of their own laws. As to any "*traditional*" evidence of the New Testament, it is altogether unnecessary. The gospels and epistles were all (with the exception of those by St. John) written from about sixty to forty years previous to the death of that saint. We have shown from the Scriptures (page 38) the certain means adopted by the apostles for their preservation; and when we consider the numerous copies and impressions taken of them, unless we are to suppose transcribers and printers are infallible, as well as cardinals (after they are elected Popes), it must appear a matter of surprise that no difference is found in the various readings relating to *Faith*.

We should have felt ourselves much obliged to the Pope or Dr. Challoner, if either of these gentlemen had informed us *why* we cannot "tell what is scripture and what is not,"† without their traditions. We readily admit that a fact would not be less true, were there no other authority upon which it rested but tradition, although it would be much more liable to be disputed; but a generally received tradition may, in profane matters, be preferred to the writings of fabulous historians. Had not Julius Cæsar written an account

* *See Dr. Cosin's Schol. Hist. of the Can. of Holy Scripture.*

† The Church of Rome, by a somewhat strange fatality, is ever labouring to mystify and cast doubt and discredit upon the genuineness and authenticity of the very scriptures which she professes to believe are "the infallible word of God." Romanists believe Homer and Hesiod not only wrote, but that their own writings were *really* written by themselves (*a*), although these men lived nearly 1000 years before our Saviour was born. But, if in the teeth of all the precautions evidently taken by the inspired penmen to preserve the written doctrines which they had taught, Popery will have them to be doubted, she will surely believe in *profane* history which tells us of such emperors as Antoninus and Severus? Now, to these emperors it was to whom Justin Martyr, Tertullian, and others, wrote their "Apologies for the Christians;" the one by Justin (who became a convert to christianity A. D. 132.) to Antoninus *quotes from all the four Gospels;* and in this "Apology" he expressly says, that on the day called Sunday, portions of these gospels were *read in the public assemblies of the Christians.* If further proof had been necessary, would this fact have proved nothing as to the *genuineness* of the gospels, and of their being *read* by the earliest Christians.

(*a*) Mr. Charles Butler, in his ingenious essay on the "Literature of Greece," suggests that a civilized and powerful nation of Bramins existed, from whom Homer caught the "celestial fire;" but that the writings of his predecessors were lost. We must confess that this appears to us of a more doubtful nature than the Scriptures.

of his conquest of Britain, and it had been known to the present age but through the imperfect medium of oral tradition, yet such a tradition would have, no doubt, been preferred to the fables of the kings Brute, Lear, Bladud, &c. as they are told by Geoffrey of Monmouth. But how very different is the case with the inspired apostles, who received the Holy Ghost to enable them to perform miracles,—that, in the infancy of the Christian Church, the unbeliever might be convinced; and to leave as the unerring guide to truth, that sacred volume upon which Popery—in the conscious fear of its influence upon her passive votaries—has stamped her denying seal? For whatever is urged, contrary to the Scriptures*, by the Romish Church, a traditional authority is supplied, and as Christ himself says (Matt. xv. 6), "Thus have ye made the commandment of God of none effect by your *tradition*." St. Paul says, (Col. ii. v. 8.) "Beware lest any man spoil you through philosophy and vain deceit, after the tradition of men." The quotation in the Romish text (from 2 Thess. ii. v. 15) is misapplied, as usual. As the Gospel of Christ was taught *before it was written*, of course, it was *then* delivered by word of mouth, and was consequently *traditional*. The first and second Epistles to the Thessalonians were written (as the Romish Church admits) *before* any of

* "The Popes permitted their champions to indulge themselves openly in reflections injurious to the dignity of the Scriptures, and by an excess of blasphemy almost incredible, to declare publicly, that the edicts of the pontiffs, and the records of oral tradition, were superior, in point of authority, to the express language of scripture." *Mosheim*, vol. iv. p. 213.—"Owing to the early corruptions introduced into christianity by philosophy, and of the attempts afterwards to conceal and vilify the scriptures, when the Lutheran controversy had been carried on for some time, many of the monks in Scotland were so ignorant of their contents, as to charge Luther with being the author of that wicked book called the New Testament." *Jortin's Life of Eras.*, vol. i. p. 126.—This hostility to the scriptures is still persisted in by the Popish clergy, if we are to credit the most useful records of our own times, with the same rabid hatred. "About a fortnight ago, while the Roman Catholic curate of Dungiven was holding a Station in one of his parishioners' houses, whose wife was, we understand, a Protestant, and where there happened to be a Protestant Testament, he seized the sacred volume, and condemning it with vehemence, as unfit for the public eye, he committed it to the flames, before the family, and heaped coals upon it lest it should escape his fury. We pledge ourselves to the truth of this statement, and we defy Mr. F—— to contradict it." *Londonderry Journal, April*, 1825.

the other of the epistles or gospels, with the exception of that by St. Matthew, which was written about A. D. 41,—Mark, A. D. 61,—Luke, A. D. 63.—Thessalonians, A. D. 52, and the twelve other Epistles of Paul, between the latter date and 65-6; the Epistles of Peter, &c. about the year 60. How then could Paul, in his first epistles, call the doctrines taught by himself and the other apostles by any other term than tradition *until they were written?* The references to the other texts of scripture are equally unfortunate. The law had been *written* of which Moses said, "ask thy father and he will *shew* thee, and thy elders and they will tell thee." This passage is taken from the thirty-second chapter of Deuteronomy; but the preceding one (ch. xxxi. ver. 9, 10, 11, 12, 13) informs us that Moses delivered the *written* law to the priests, that it might be *read* to all Israel, that the men, women, children, and the stranger might learn to fear the Lord. The versicles in the xix. Psalm (ver. 5, 6, 7), to which we are referred, are these, speaking of the heavens: "In them hath he set a tabernacle for the sun, which cometh forth as a bridegroom out of his chamber, and rejoiceth as a giant to run his course. It goeth forth from the uttermost part of the heaven, and runneth about unto the end of it again; and there is nothing hid from the heat thereof. The law of the Lord is an undefiled law, converting the soul; the testimony of the Lord is sure and giveth wisdom unto the simple." 1 Cor. xi. 2. "Now I praise you, brethren, that you remember me in all things, and keep the ordinances *as I delivered them to you.*" We have already shown why Paul speaks of tradition in his Epistles to the Thessalonians; of Timothy (ii. Epist. i. 13.) he requests that he will hold fast the sound words which he (Paul) had taught him, and teach others (ii. ver. 2.); and (chap. iii. ver. 13) desiring him to remember *of whom he had learned them.*" Such are the texts of scripture referred to in proof of the *genuineness and authenticity of papal tradition!* Comment upon their application, or misapplication,

is unnecessary; they are before our readers, to the evidence of whose senses we appeal.

SECT. III.—*Of the Ordinances and Constitutions of the Church.*

Why do you make profession of admitting and embracing all the ordinances and constitutions of the Church.

Because Christ has so commanded. "He that heareth you, heareth me; and he that despiseth you, despiseth me," Luke x. 16. "As my Father hath sent me, even so I send you," John xx. 24. Hence St. Paul, Heb. xiii. 17, tells us, "Obey them that have the rule over you, and submit yourselves."

Why does the church command so many holidays to be kept? Is it not enough to keep the Sunday holy?

God in the old law did not think it enough to appoint the weekly sabbath, which was the Saturday; but also ordained other festivals, as that of the passover, in memory of the delivery of his people from Egyptian bondage, that of the weeks or pentecost, that of tabernacles, &c. and the church has done the same in the new law, to celebrate the memory of the chief mysteries of our redemption, and to bless God in his saints. And in this *protestants* seem to agree with us, by appointing almost all the same holidays in their common prayer-book.

Is it not said in the law (Exod. xx. 9), "Six days shalt thou labour and do all thy work," &c.? *Why then should the Church derogate from this part of the commandment?*

This was to be understood in case no holiday came in the week; otherwise the law would contradict itself, when, in the 23rd chapter of Leviticus, it appoints so many other holidays besides the *Sabbath*, with command to abstain from all servile work on them.

As to fasting days, do you look upon it sinful to eat meat on those days without necessity?

Yes: because it is a sin to disobey the Church: "If he neglect to hear the Church, let him be to thee as a heathen and a publican." Matt. xviii. 17.

Does not Christ say (Matt. xv. 11), "That which goeth into the mouth doth not defile a man?"

True: it is not any uncleanness in the meat, as many ancient heretics have imagined, or any dirt or dust which may stick to it by eating it without first washing the hands (of which case our Lord speaks in the text here quoted), which can defile the soul; for every creature of God is good, and whatsoever corporal filth enters in at the mouth is cast forth into the draught: but that which defiles the soul, when a person eats meat on a fasting day, is the disobedience of heart, in transgressing the precept of the Church of God. In like manner, when Adam ate of the forbidden fruit, it was not the

apple which entered in by the mouth, but the disobedience to the law of God which defiled him.

After asking why the numerous ordinances of the Romish Church are professed, why are we not *told* the true cause of their institution by the Church herself? After perusing the Romish "Profession of Faith," in the beginning of this book, we understand plainly enough that the first step to becoming a *good* Roman Catholic is to give up our Reason, and not only to believe whatever that "Church" says is infallible, but whatever the Pope (if he be the Church) may, at any future period, command to be believed. But we cannot find in the Scriptures, nor can the Romish Church, that Christ commanded the *theatrical* displays exhibited in the Church of Rome. He tells us his kingdom is not of this world—the kingdom of Popery is of a widely different constitution. Has the finery of her decorations, her baubles and processions, any resemblance to the simple form of worship practised by the Primitive Christians? Are the placing of *Dolls* in ornamented boxes, &c. ordinances of Christ as representations of his own birth, and as displayed by the Romish Church? But English Romanists should reside in a Papal territory to see these mummeries in their *purity;* and even then they must *join* in them, or they would be denounced as heretics*. The texts of the first paragraph have been already quoted, and to which we have replied. But "he who heareth you heareth me," &c. is always appealed to to sanctify every impropriety of the Romish Church, when not even the *shadow* of a scriptural text can be found that may be so misapplied as to afford even a reference. Neither should it be said that "*Protestants*

* English Romanists would not feel any peculiar gratification in meeting the procession of the Host half-a-dozen times on a dirty day, where, upon each occasion, they must drop on their knees in the streets. We have already said Papists must yield up all their senses to their Church, and their Church, in return, permits them to see her own processions and other fine shows. We cannot afford space for entering into a detail of these mummeries of a religion, the bulk of which consists of external ceremonies; we shall briefly notice them in the proper places as we proceed.

seem to agree" with such absurd ordinances of Popery:—Protestants never *can* agree to such ordinances *: but it must not be forgotten that, in the reform of abuses, the Protestant Church "*made no alterations for* NOVELTY'S *sake:*" her sole object was to restore Christianity, as nearly as possible, to its primeval simplicity.

What the feasts commanded to be kept by the old Law have to do with the fasts ordained by Popery, we do not clearly perceive: but the impiety of comparing the mandate of any secular priest to the command of God himself to our first parents, sounds to all Christian ears—those of Papists alone excepted—as one of the many assertions of the Romish Church which appear absolutely blasphemous. But, although we disapprove of the comparison, we must admit that it is well managed to place the *sinfulness* of the matter in disobeying the "Church," since neither Christ nor his apostles deemed it any sin at all. There is no crime in *voluntarily* fasting—the Scriptures tell us the *sin* lies *in condemning those who do not fast.* But, before we enter upon our Scriptural proofs, we must take leave to ask, why is the line from *St. Matthew only* quoted to show that it is wrong for those who are hungry to eat when they can get food? We have frequently complained of the very meagre and inapplicable sentences adduced; but in the present case whole pages might, we must candidly acknowledge, have been brought forward directly bearing on the question; but, as the Pope and Dr. Challoner have passed them by, we will content ourselves with a few extracts, and refer to others too numerous to quote.

1 Cor. ch. x. v. 25 to 33.—Whatsoever is sold in the shambles, that eat, *asking no questions for conscience sake;*

* Making saints to worship them (of which we shall speak hereafter) is not the province of the Reformed Church; her days of *obligation*, as defined in our Common Prayer-Book, are those dedicated to the saints who were famed in the Scriptures *only*. But as Popish saints were good and bad, and more of them bad than good, we celebrate the memory of the good ones on "All Saints" Day.

for the earth is the Lord's, and the fulness thereof. If any of them that believe not bid you to a feast, and ye be disposed to go, whatsoever is set before you, *eat, asking no questions for conscience sake,* &c. &c. &c.

We deem it altogether unnecessary to give very copious extracts on this subject, since it is spoken of by Christ and the Apostles in almost every Epistle and every Gospel in the New Testament. The *whole* of the 14th chap. of the Epist. to the Romans, treats of "Days and Meats" being "Indifferent," and to which we also refer our readers: it cannot be *misunderstood* by any person capable of reading it—it speaks thus: "I know and am persuaded by the Lord Jesus that there is nothing unclean of itself, but to him that esteemeth any thing to be unclean, to *him it is* unclean:"—"the kingdom of God is not meat and drink; but righteousness, and peace, and joy in the Holy Ghost," &c. &c. One short extract more we think it proper to make here: if we were to say we think it obviously written to guard the early Christians against Popery, we should, by our Roman Catholic brethren, be deemed "*illiberal;*" and yet not one of their priests can deny the *accuracy* of the quotation we are about to make, and in which the Apostle positively avers he speaks in the spirit of the Holy Ghost. The chapter to which we allude (1 Tim. iv.) commences thus:—

1. Now the Spirit speaketh expressly, that in the *latter times* some shall depart from the faith, giving heed to following spirits [*i. e.* seducing spirits, who teach false doctrines, affect the power of working miracles, &c.] and doctrines of devils.

2. Speaking lies in hypocrisy, their conscience *seared with a hot iron,* [*i. e.* lost to all sense of humanity].

3. *Forbidding to marry, and commanding to abstain from meats which* God *hath created to be received with thanksgiving:*

4. For it is sanctified by the word of God and prayer, &c.

However the Popish Clergy may command that none of their congregation should eat, and however great the power of the Pope to empower them to do so, we trust that we have clearly shown that both he and Dr. Challoner *might* have found *many* texts of Scripture more applicable to their subject than the solitary line which they have produced from the 18th chapter of St. Matthew, and which solely relates to *How often we should forgive injuries* *.

As the next chapter is a very long one, we shall vary a little from our usual plan, by giving a few paragraphs at a time, adducing our authorities, and commenting upon them as we proceed.

Chap. III.—Of the Sacraments.

What do you mean by a sacrament?

An institution of Christ consisting in some outward sign or ceremony, by which grace is given to the soul of the worthy receiver.

How many such sacraments do you find in scripture?

These seven: *Baptism, Confirmation, Eucharist,* (which Protestants call the Lord's Supper), *Penance, Extreme Unction* (or the anointing of the sick), *Holy Orders,* and *Matrimony.*

What scripture have you for Baptism?

John iii. 5. "Except a man be born of water and of the spirit, he cannot enter into the kingdom of God." Matt. xxviii. 19. "Go, teach

---

* Although we are not here told why good folk should fast for any other reason than "because it is a sin to disobey the Church," yet this "Church" *has* her reasons for so commanding, and which we shall beg leave to give in her own words, as they are expressed in the Child's "*First Catechism;*" a book published under the authority of the Popish Bishops, and to which we shall again have occasion to refer. Of course that which is the most deeply impressed upon the mind of infants by their instructors, is intended to be the most firmly established in their hearts throughout their future lives; and this premised, our readers may judge for themselves of the great *ease* and *certainty* of Papists "going to heaven" *if they will but believe their priests.*

Q. *Why* does the "Church" command us to fast?

A. That, *by fasting,* we may SATISFY GOD FOR OUR SINS !!!

What Protestant, who could believe in such doctrine as this, would not envy the state of the poorest of our unhappy and starving Irish fellow-subjects? But that their souls should be drugged with such tenets as the above, is, we fear, the very greatest of their misfortunes. We should thank any of our Popish brethren—lay or clerical—who would inform us where they could find such a doctrine in the *Scriptures?* But, alas! they cannot; and therefore they must, once more, thrust in their "infallibility."

all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost."

How do you prove that this commission given to the Apostles of baptizing all nations, is to be understood of baptism administered in water?

From the belief and practice of the Church of Christ in all ages, and of the apostles themselves, who administered baptism in water: Acts viii. 36, 38. "See, here is water," said the Eunuch to St. Philip, "what does hinder me from being baptized?—and they went down into the water, both Philip and the Eunuch; and he baptized him." Acts x. 47, 48. "Can any man forbid water," said St. Peter, "that these should not be baptized who have received the Holy Ghost as well as we? And he commanded them to be baptized in the name of the Lord."

Of these *seven* sacraments we will speak as they occur, but we may here observe, that by the above question and reply, "What Scripture have you for baptism," &c. the Pope and the Doctor both appear to have forgotten that it is asserted in Section II. (p. 73) that "*Infant baptism, and several other necessary articles are either not at all contained in Scripture, or, at least, not plain in the Scripture without the help of tradition.*" Truly, if they had given more of the Scriptures, and less of their "Church," it had been better for their readers, generally. However, they *have* found more texts in favour of baptism than they can find for Popery; although we think a much better explanation might have been found than that which they have given. But *two sacraments only* do Protestants admit, *as generally necessary to salvation*—ordained by Christ, viz. Baptism and the Lord's Supper. We now proceed to Confirmation:—

What do you mean by Confirmation?

Confirmation is a sacrament, wherein, by the invocation of the Holy Ghost, and imposition of the Bishop's hands with the unction of holy chrism, a person receives the grace of the Holy Ghost, and a strength in order to the professing of his faith.

What scripture have you for Confirmation?

Acts viii. 15, 17, where Peter and John confirmed the Samaritans. "They prayed for them that they might receive the Holy Ghost—Then laid they their hands on them, and they received the Holy Ghost."

What scripture have you for the Eucharist, or supper of the Lord?

We have the history of its institution set down at large, Matt. xxvi., Mark xiv., Luke xvii., 1 Cor. xi., and that this sacrament was to be continued in the Church "till the Lord comes," that is, till the day of judgment, as we learn from St. Paul, 1 Cor. xi. 26.

Sacraments are the *signs* and *seals* of our faith, as circumcision was to Abraham (Rom. iv. 11); but they are not a part of our faith itself, nor spoken of in that summary of it called the Apostles' Creed. An established ordinance of a Church, *when not opposed to the Scriptures,* should be attended to; and had Confirmation and Extreme Unction been *all,* the Church of Rome had never broken communion with the greater part of the Christian world, whether they had been considered as sacraments or ordinances *. Protestants believe Confirmation to be a renewal of their Christian vows, which it is obligatory upon them to make, and that it is beneficial for

* It is not to be supposed by this expression that men who, in the exercise of their own reason with which God had gifted them that they might distinguish truth from error, would have yielded to the superstitions and seducing foppery as practised by the Romish Church at the present day, though had Confirmation been a chief point in dispute, it might, perhaps, have been reduced to the level of common sense. As in the Church of the Jews, the *mercy* of the law was lost to those who, with pharisaical sanctity, strictly attended to its external observances, even to the *tything of mint, anise* and *cummin,* so is the pure religion of Christ ever obscured by the vanities of Popery, when she can introduce them—whilst she constantly profanes the name of the Almighty throughout her endless traditions (so contrary to his express command) to strengthen prejudice, and mislead ignorance. For the sacred name of HIM who can only be *worshipped in spirit and in truth,* we shall more properly, on the present occasion, substitute that which is *really meant*—the Pope himself—*his* Confirmations will then be better understood.—"The obligations which accompany the character of (Papal) confirmation" are these:—He (the Papist) is "to bear a true and perpetual allegiance to the *Pope,* in whose service he *lists* himself as a soldier: to stand to his colours the mark of which he receives in his forehead [the cross of the Priest's finger] *to fight his battles against his enemies,* the world, &c. &c.—to be faithful unto death, and rather to die than desert from the service [i. e. of Popery], or to change sides," &c. &c. &c.—but if Papists become "*deserters* and *rebels,*" &c.—it will "be a mark of eternal ignominy, and reproach to their souls amongst the damned." In the course of the ceremony, the Bishop gives each of his flock a pat on the cheek, which creates the *patience* and *humility* they are *ever after* endued with. Much then is said of the spiritual efficacy of the *chrism* with which they are anointed; and which, we are told, is composed "of *oil of olives* and *balsam—solemnly consecrated—kept with great veneration in the Church*—with which *the Chalices,* &c. *are anointed,* and that *it would be no less a crime than sacrilege,* to use profanely anything thus sanctified." It is then said, "the *mysterious* compound of oil and balm denotes the graces, &c. of the Holy Spirit in their souls, by the *strengthening and softening of the oil,* and *the sweet odour of the balm,*" &c. Does all this acting and show make these ceremonies a *sacrament* and an essential to obtain salvation?

them to do so; but they do not believe in it as the hierarchal superstition of the Popish Church, viz. that their pastors have the power of conferring the gifts of the Holy Ghost upon them as they were conferred by the Apostles upon their own disciples in the infant state of the Christian Church. But if Papists actually receive the Holy Ghost from their priests, it is no wonder that the *laity are as infallible as their clergy*.

As the Supper of the Lord is commanded by CHRIST himself, of course it is practised in the Protestant Church in the express manner in which he commanded it to be received; and this sacrament and baptism being the *only two* ordained by our Saviour, they are the only two which the primitive Bishops acknowledged. The Romish Church cannot say the other five which she has introduced are even *generally necessary to salvation*, since *no* member of her Church can partake of them *all;* her *sacrament* of Holy Orders excludes the *laity;*—her *sacrament* of marriage excludes her *clergy;*—were it not for her self-assumed happy faculty of manufacturing miracles (among which, laying prostrate the senses of, otherwise, sensible men, is by far the greatest)—what a miserable figure would she make when divested of the superstitious mantle by which her native deformity is enveloped! We now come to the *sacrament* of Penance, and are, at once, put into the confessional, thus:—

What do you mean by the sacrament of Penance?

The confession of sins, with a sincere repentance, and the priest's absolution.

What scripture have you to prove that the bishops and priests of the Church have power to absolve the sinner that confesses his sins with a sincere repentance?

John xx. 22, 23. "Receive ye the Holy Ghost: Whosesoever sins ye remit, they are remitted unto them: And whosesoever sins ye retain, they are retained." Matt. xviii. 18. "Verily I say unto you, Whatsoever ye shall bind on earth, shall be bound in heaven: And whatsoever ye shall loose on earth, shall be loosed in heaven." Which texts Protestants seem to understand in the same manner as

we, since in their *Common Prayer Book*, in the order for the *Visitation of the Sick*, we find this rubric: "Here shall the sick person be moved to make a special confession of his sins, if he feel his conscience troubled with any weighty matter. After which confession the priest shall absolve him (if he humbly and heartily desire it) after this sort:

"Our Lord Jesus Christ, who hath left power to his Church to absolve all sinners who truly repent and believe in him, of his great mercy forgive thee thine offences; and by his authority committed to me, I absolve thee from all thy sins, in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost. Amen."

How do you prove from the text above quoted of John xx. 22, 23, and Matt. xviii. 18, *the necessity of the faithful confessing their sins to the pastors of the church, in order to obtain the absolution and remission of them?*

Because, in the text above quoted, Christ has made the pastors of the Church his *judges* in the court of conscience, with commission and authority to *bind*, or to *loose*, to *forgive*, or to *retain sins*, according to the merits of the cause, and the disposition of the penitents. Now, as no judge can pass sentence without having a full knowledge of the cause; which cannot be had in this kind of causes, which regard men's consciences, but by their own confession; it clearly follows, that he who has made the pastors of the Church the judges of men's consciences, has also laid an obligation upon the faithful to lay open the state of their consciences to them, if they hope to have their sins remitted. Nor would our Lord have given to his Church the power of *retaining sins*, much less the *keys of the kingdom of heaven*, Matt. xvi. 19, if such sins as exclude men from the kingdom of heaven might be remitted independently of the keys of the Church.

Have you any other texts of scripture which favour the Catholic doctrine and practice of Confession?

Yes. We find in the old law, which was a figure of the law of Christ, that such as were infected with the leprosy, which was a figure of sin, were obliged to show themselves to the priests, and subject themselves to their judgment. See Lev. xiii. and xiv., Matt. viii. 4. Which, according to the holy Fathers, was an emblem of the confession of sins in the sacrament of penance. And in the same law a special confession of sins was expressly prescribed. Num. v. 6, 7. "When a man or woman shall commit any sin that men commit, to do a trespass against the Lord, and that person be guilty: Then they shall confess their sins which they have done." The same is prescribed in the New Testament, James v. 16, "Confess your faults one to another;" that is, to the priests or elders of the Church, whom the apostle had ordered to be called for, ver. 14. And this was evidently the practice of the first Chris-

tians, Acts xix. 18, "Many that believed, came and confessed, and showed their deeds."

The passages quoted from SS. John and Matthew are those upon which the Pope and his clergy found their claims to bless or curse whom they please*. But, before we proceed farther, we must beg *here* to notice a Popish *reason* which will be seen in the fifth chapter, where we are told that, as an excuse for taking the cup from the laity, Christ, when he said, "Drink ye all of it," *only* addressed himself to the Apostles who *were* the ALL.—And who, we ask, were those to whom he addressed himself when he said, "Whosesoever sins *ye* remit," &c.? However, this method of Popish reasoning is too contemptible for us to follow, since we are opposed to Garnet's Safeguard of Equivocation†. Let us examine the question on its own merits; but we must once more protest

* By the *Bulla in Cœna Domini* (read annually at Rome), "the excommunication and anathematization of all Heretics whatsoever, and their favourers," &c. is too clearly expressed to be misunderstood by the most credulous; all Protestant and Popish sovereigns also, who do not annul, &c. all laws contrary to the tenor of this Bull, are alike objects of its ban; and as such a circumstance never occurred, nor ever will occur, all the world are anathematized; and (by the 24th Section of Paul V.) past the power of that Pope, or any of his successors, to absolve them!!!—The University of Coimbra says (*Hist. des Papes, tom.* v. *p.* 476,) it "knows that *by the mouth of the Sovereign Pontiff it is God himself who speaks*"!!!—(See p. 32.)

† Henry Garnet, the Jesuit, whom Romanists venerate as a martyr, and whom Protestants execrate as a traitor. We will meet each party half-way, in the words of Mr. Townsend, (Accus. of Hist., p. 278) "He died the death of a hypocrite, for his falsehood was justified by his faith; and he might have believed it to be sanctioned by his Church. By wickedness he would have served God; by equivocation he would have supported religion. He died a *martyr*, a *liar*, and a *traitor!*"

This Garnet was one of the principal conspirators against the British throne and nation, and who complotted with the King of Spain to send over troops to destroy both, the year previous to Elizabeth's death. In 1604, he was a chief agitator of the Gunpowder plot; and on the 1st day of October in that year, as Mr. Townsend tells us, (p. 265) "Garnet openly prayed for the good success of the *great action, about to happen* at the commencement of the Parliament." This wretched man was the patronizer of a book, (see the above work, p. 271) entitled "*Treatise on Equivocation*," which was written "*in defence of lying and fraudulent dissimulation*," wherein such *holy* exertions might be deemed necessary by afflicted Papists, who could thus do justice to the "good cause" of Popery and save themselves—by *equivocation!* Arch-priest Blackwell also approved of this book. It was found in the desk of Francis Tresham (a colleague of Garnet's in the Gunpowder plot) after his death. Speaking of the perjuries of Garnet, "This," says Sir Edward Coke, (in a letter to Lord Salisbury, dated March 24, 1605-6—State Paper, No. 208.) "This is the fruit of equivocation, (the book whereof was found in Tresham's desk,) to affirm manifest falsehoods, upon his salvation, *in ipso articulo mortis*. It is true, no man may judge in this case; but it is the most fearful example that I ever knew to be made so evident as this is."

against the repeated efforts of Popery to assimilate her own tenets—or drawing any invidious comparisons between them and those of the Reformed Church; a Church which, to say the very least of it, holds the doctrine of auricular confession as decidedly hostile to Scripture, and most subversive of morality. Christ, undoubtedly, used the expressions quoted from John and Matthew—expressions in themselves clear and explicit; and which, we think, none but men who deemed their *temporal interests* of more importance than their *spiritual* welfare could have misinterpreted; but we do not see quite so clearly as the Pope and Dr. Challoner, that by these words the *most distant allusion* is made to a *Pope;* and, it so happened, that there was not a Christian at Rome at the time Christ spoke them. The Scriptures do not tell us that either of the Apostles was a Bishop of Rome, nor that Peter was *ever* there, as was Paul; but assuming that he *had* been there, and that he *had* appointed a successor, &c. &c., by the same rule that the Pope claims a right of granting or selling pardons, *every Christian* may, in the name of Christ, (Mark xvi. v. 18.) "take up serpents; and if they drink any deadly thing it shall not hurt them; they shall lay hands on the sick, and they shall recover." These expressions were used by our Saviour at the same time as those above:—Yet who, save Prince Hohenlohe alone, has appeared *publicly to the world,* as a miracle-worker in the present age, and even his Highness has evinced a most judicious shrewdness in chiefly confining his operations to the nervous ladies within the walls of some cloister, who, we apprehend, very naturally exerted *themselves*, in aid of the pious endeavours of the Prince, to *effect their own recovery?*

No Christian can doubt the miraculous powers conferred upon the Apostles, nor of their power of conferring them upon others:—Yet, who but ignorant or bigoted Papists, if we may assume there are such, believe that this power still

exists? And is it for erring mortals, such as we are, to inquire when the Almighty thought fit no longer to place such power in the creatures of his hand?

We have already said, when the Reformation took place no alterations were made for the sake of *novelty*. In the year 1548, our most learned Bishops reduced the principles and forms of the Protestant religion as nearly as possible to the *primitive standard of the first and purest ages of Christianity;* and to which end they carefully inspected the Missals, Breviaries, Rituals, Pontificals, Graduals, Psalters, Antiphonals, and all other service books, then in use*. The criticism of envious malignity cannot impugn our Liturgy; and why are we to be told by Popery that by the Rubric alluded to we acquiesce in *her doctrines,* which we decidedly reject? The Protestant clergyman does *not* seek to obtain a confession of a sick penitent *as a necessary means of his* (the penitent's) *salvation;* on the contrary, he tells the sinner truly to repent, and implore the pardon of his God, who can alone judge of his sincerity. But if "any weighty matter" still hang upon his conscience—some guilty secret perhaps, by the disclosure of which the minister may *prevent* crime, or render some act of justice, &c.—should not *such* a secret be divulged? *A Protestant* minister is *not* bound to *conceal* confessions of intended murder, treason, &c. &c., so communicated by a dying penitent; and although the Protestant clergyman, by virtue of the promise of Christ to his Church, absolves the sinner if he truly repent, yet he does *not* assume a power which Christ did not leave to it:—he does *not* say, however contrite a heart may be offered up to Almighty God, it *shall not be accepted* by DIVINE MERCY, unless he himself be applied to, and first pass *his own* opinion of what portion of worldly annoyance *he* may think proper to inflict

* See Downes' Appendix to the Lives of the Compilers of the Liturgy, p. 150, *ut supra*; London, 1722.

in the way of *penance*. The Protestant clergyman does *not* affect a power of sending souls to heaven or hell, as they may purchase his indulgence, or deny his authority; in short, let any Popish priest who would insinuate to his followers that the Protestant minister teaches such doctrines as we have denied, make the statement *plainly*, and he will soon be called upon for his *proofs*.

We deny that Christ ever made Popery a judge in "the court of conscience," and defy her to prove that there is the least allusion to her *future* existence made by Christ or his Apostles, throughout the whole of the Scriptures, otherwise than as the "*Antichrist*" of the Revelations, if she choose so to apply it to herself. *The Court of Inquisition* is the court wherein the most clear explanations are given of the power of "*binding* and *loosing*," as it has been exerted by Popery. Why has not Pius IV. shown us his scriptural authorities for *these* establishments? He was himself their patron and supporter; and his piety in publishing his Bull against those, who, in the most disgusting and horrible manner, abused the "*sacramental confession*," might have been more eloquently expatiated upon by his admirers, had he not, after creating irremedial misery in hundreds of families, with the most condescending love for the "pastors of his Church" condemned their vices—*to repose in eternal oblivion**. Pope Pius IV. *could* have told us *by what means*

* "*Those who solicit* women, or boys, to dishonourable actions in the sacramental confession are subject to this tribunal (the Inquisition.) Pope Pius IV. published a bull against them; and when the bull was first brought into Spain, all persons were commanded by a public edict, solemnly published throughout the archbishopric of Seville, that whosoever knew or had heard of any monks or clergymen who had abused the sacrament of confession to these crimes, or had in any manner acted in this vile manner at confession with their wives or daughters, they should discover them within thirty days to the *Holy Tribunal;* and very grievous censures were annexed to such as should neglect or contemn it. When the decree was published, so large a number of women went to the palace of the Inquisitors *in the city of Seville only*, to make their discoveries of these most wicked confessors, that *twenty Secretaries, with as many Inquisitors*, were *not sufficient* to *take the depositions of the witnesses!* The lords Inquisitors being thus overwhelmed with the multitude of affairs, assigned *another thirty days* for the witnesses; and when *this was not sufficient* they were forced to *appoint the same number a third and a fourth time!* For, as to *women of reputation*, and others of higher condition, every time was not pro-

his agents obtained *more** than even "a full knowledge of the cause" they sought to elucidate; and that when the disgrace of his Church became *too* public to pass without some public notice of it, the *policy* of the sacrifices made, was to torture the culprit by the most savage acts of barbarism; but these sort of criminals were never openly punished, unless their own indifference to the publicity of their enormities *obliged* their superiors to take notice of them†. But let us suppose that, *at the present time*, in a Roman Catholic country subject to the British Government, a Popish divine to be "overtaken" (such is the term we have heard applied to the case in question) with the spirit (of whisky), and on whose head the bump of *amativeness* is conspicuously prominent—(we have known *several* such)—let us, we say—or rather let our readers, but *imagine* the dreadful consequences of this man's *judgment* as to the sins of his fair penitents—we will speak of the *instructions* to young priests, presently. Many English people are accustomed to visit Rome; and such may judge of the correctness of the account given of the Roman dames by the Cavalier de

---

per for them to apply to the Inquisitors. On the one hand, their conscience forced them to a discovery through a superstitious fear of the censures and excommunication; and, on the other hand, their regard to their husbands whom they were afraid to offend, by giving them very ill suspicion of their chastity, kept them at home; and therefore veiling their faces after the Spanish custom, they went to the lords Inquisitors, when, and as privately as, they could. Very few, however, with all their prudence and craft, could escape the diligent observation of their husbands at the time of discovery, and hereby possessed their minds with the deepest jealousy. However, after so many had been informed against before the Inquisitors, that *Holy Tribunal*, contrary to all men's expectations, put a stop to the affair, and commanded all those crimes, which were proved by legal evidence, to be *buried in eternal oblivion*." *Dr. Chandler's Hist. of Pers.*, p. 190.

* *See Proceedings of the Trib. of the Inquis.*, where innocent persons are persuaded to acknowledge themselves guilty under a promise of pardon, and whose confessions thus extorted, are made the pretext for condemning them to the torture.

† "The Venetians ordered one of them (the confessors) to be burned alive, by command of the Pope. He had been father confessor to some nuns in the dominions of Venice, and had got twelve of them with child; amongst whom the abbess and two others had children in one year. As he was confessing them, he agreed with them about the place, manner, and time of lying with them. All were filled with admiration and astonishment, taking the man for a perfect saint, he had so great a show of sanctity in his very face."—*Epist. ad Belgas, Cent. I. Ep.* 66. p. 345, *and Ep.* 63. p, 316.—*Referred to by Dr. Chandler, Hist. of Pers.*, p. 191.

Angelis, who says, (European Review, No. 6. 1826) "A blind superstition retains the lower class in an absolute dependence on the clergy, who have, unfortunately, but too much interest in relaxing its morals. It is impossible for 600,000 men devoted to celibacy to insinuate themselves into the privacy of families without causing in them confusion and scandal."—After describing the immorality of the female part of the community of Italy, he says, "We are authorized to load them (the priests) with this reproach, when we see that where they have no power the people are much better brought up; and this difference cannot be ascribed to any other cause, since Rome and Naples, where there is the least morality, are not in a more deplorable political situation than Lombardy and Tuscany." And so much for the morality of the Pope's judges in his "court of conscience," whose judgments, according to the Cavalier, must be, among their fair penitents, most *unconscionable.*

It is next said, (Matt. xvi. 19,) "Nor would our Lord have given to his Church the power of *retaining sins,* much less the *keys of the kingdom of heaven,* if such sins as exclude men from the kingdom of heaven might be remitted independently of the keys of the Church." Now, that such enormous crimes "as *exclude men from the kingdom of heaven*" can be put away by every, or by *any,* "miserable sinner," ordained by a Popish Bishop, who, having, for the most part, lived many years longer in a sinful world, is, in all probability, a still *greater sinner himself* than the sinner he ordains—that such an absurdity should have ever held an influence over any but the most puerile of minds would appear astonishing, were not the Scriptures denied to those who have been thus taught to believe; and, on the other hand, deeply-instilled prejudices cherished by the learned. The chapter of Matthew, referred to above, we have already noticed, (page 36,) wherein Peter is *reproved:* these few lines, upon which the whole super-

structure of Popery is raised, are so frequently referred to, that, to save unnecessary repetitions on our own part, we will defer what other scriptural quotations we have to adduce in contradiction to the power assumed by the Papal Church, until the *last* time it is introduced in the "Grounds of Faith." However, the *blasphemy* of the above extract cannot surely be misunderstood by the most superficial reader: viz.—The ALMIGHTY HIMSELF CANNOT PARDON UNLESS APPLICATION BE MADE BY ONE FRAGILE ATOM TO ANOTHER. This is the TRUE meaning of the impious sentence; and we can prove this doctrine to have been publicly preached in a Popish chapel in London. May God direct those who place their hopes of salvation on so baseless a fabric!

That these "*keys*" spoken of may be appreciated by the vulgar more effectively, representations of *door-keys* are exhibited in Papal books suspended to the girdles of Popish figures; and, instead of being understood in a *typical* sense, as it is hereafter expressed, the more ignorant classes of Romanists are *thus* taught to suppose that their priests (as is, indeed, *fully* stated in the above extract) have merely to open or close the "gate of heaven" *ad libitum*. But by a belief in the virtue of a Romish priest's "key of heaven," the priest himself is enabled to unlock every private thought and action; and which *he* is taught to do—even in domestic matters, upon which *a husband would not converse with his own wife*. True it is, that priests of the Romish persuasion make vows of celibacy; and they have declared so often that they keep them, that many of their followers believe it. As this, however, is a matter of opinion, (with Protestants at least,) without offering one ourselves upon so delicate a subject, we assert, without the fear of contradiction, that among their own theological works there are those not only of the most indelicate description, but such as the most debauched libertine of the age might apply to, to *improve* himself in the wiles of seduction. We speak of such *holy* works as *Dictata de*

*Sacramento Penitentiæ**, &c. Perhaps, if the Romish Church deem an *excuse* necessary, it may be urged, as *sufficient*, that these works are not translated, and are for the express use of the clergy, nor generally understood by their laity—but will this affect their obvious *tendency?*—Certainly not.

We now approach the most painful part of our task, and which is to show how females are *prepared*, by what is called their *religious* education, to submit to such questions as those which the *apostolical* Bishop, DENS, recommends to be put. This is accomplished by the first books they are taught to read in their mother tongue, and the questions asked them when they go to confession—a duty which the youth of both sexes are commanded to perform at seven years of age†. The instructions of the Bishop of Bayeaux to the priests of his diocese, for their examination of *female* children, in his *Conduite des Confesseurs*, are as clearly expressed as they are monstrous and disgusting—and the inquiries, to which we allude, are asked of female *children of seven years of age!* When the indelicacy of these inquiries occasions the children to cry, directions are given to the "pastors" of this *holy* "church" to wheedle them to be candid, &c. The whole proceedings, language, &c., are altogether of so shameless, and, as we think, so diabolical a nature, that, although these books, owned, as they are, by the *infallible* Church, clearly prove the *object* of *auricular* confession, we cannot disgrace our pages by a translation of any of the *precepts* they instil. We may, perhaps, be reminded that the books we allude to are not (if such be the case) printed in *English*—and that such means as they recommend are not adopted by the

* This *holy* composition is the work of *Dens*, who was the president of the Popish Seminary of Mechlin. Let husbands and fathers learn what it is the *duty* of their priests to inquire respecting their wives—and daughters, after they are married. "*Observent juniores Confessarii quod dum Maritus confitetor congressum cum uxore——non semper significatur S—— minor sed ordinarie copula in debito—quamvis indebitor modo,*" &c. &c. &c.—See also "*Tractatus Theologicus de Casibus Reservatis.*"

† Q. At what time do persons begin to be obliged to go to confession?

A. When they come to the *use of reason, so as to be capable of mortal sin*, which is generally supposed to be about the age of *seven years.—Child's First Cat.*

Roman Catholic clergy *here!* We know they are not; but what then? Is it from a disinclination of Popery to do so, or from a fear of the natural consequences that must accrue to herself if she did? The reply to the first is evident by the existence of such *authorized* publications in *any* civilized country; the last will be best answered by alluding to such Popish books of instruction as actually *are* published in England: from these our extracts will be few; and let it be not forgotten that we are not writing to children, but are about to show how and what the generality of Roman Catholic children in England are taught—without the extracts we are about to make we could not do this; and let us not, therefore, be condemned for quoting tenets we abhor. We shall merely notice two or three of the Papal books of *instruction* in *general use.* By the Child's First Catechism children are taught, in the most clear and explicit manner, that their sins are always to be wiped away by the *merit of their own works,* with the sanction of their priests—to *split the Ten Commandments* (to save the denial of Image-worship)—to honour their parents, *when they do not think it sinful to do so*—to pray to Saints, *of their own names in particular,* to pray for *them;*—to be sure that the *twelve* New Articles of Faith in the Romish Church are "chiefly *six,*" and the meaning of crimes they could not, otherwise, understand.

First, of the necessary *satisfaction* to God for sin committed, (from Child's First Catechism):—

Q. *What* is satisfaction?

A. *It is doing the penance given us by the priest.*

And that this act of confession may be gratifying to *self-love,* the penitent is taught to believe it is an act of *mortifying humility,* although the reward is an acquittance of sin.

Q. What is the first commandment?

A. I am the Lord thy God who brought thee out of the land of Egypt and out of the house of bondage. Thou shalt not have strange Gods before me. Thou shalt not make to thyself any graven thing, nor the likeness of any thing that

is in heaven above, or in the earth beneath, or in the waters under the earth; thou shalt not adore them nor serve them.

Thus are the first and second commands coupled together for the reason assigned above.

Q. What are we commanded by the *fourth* [the third] commandment?

A. By the fourth commandment we are commanded to love, honour, and obey our parents *in all that is not sin.*

However sinful parents may be, it must be rare, we trust, that parents literally *teach* their children, from seven to ten years of age, to commit sins—nor can we approve of thus constituting children of such an age, *judges,* whether or not their parents are right or wrong.

Q. Do you not desire the prayers of all saints?

A. Yes, of all saints, and *in particular of the saint of my own name,* and of my guardian angel.

Q. How many are the commandments of the Church?

A. Chiefly *six.* [See *Professions of Faith,* p. 16, 17.]

Q, What is the *ninth* [tenth] commandment?

A. Thou shalt not covet thy neighbour's wife.

Q. What is forbidden by this?

A. All lustful thoughts and desires; and all wilful pleasures in the irregular motions of the flesh.

In another examination, "What a christian is," &c., are the following:—

Q. Has Jesus Christ always been God?

A. Yes, from all eternity.

Q. *Where* was he made man?

A. In the womb of the blessed Virgin Mary.

Q. *How* was he made man?

A. Not by human generation, but by the power and virtue of the Holy Ghost.

These are the kind of expositions to which we object; and in these catechisms for *children* is plainly expressed in their

vulgar tongue, the *crimen inter christianos non nominandum!*—Are such examinations as these *proper* for children? We cannot soil our pages with further extracts of this description, and leave it to Roman Catholics themselves, whether they think their *approved "Garden of the Soul"* between pages 181 and 187, fit for the perusal of any respectable member of society? We are perfectly aware that there are parents in England who are particularly cautious in *expunging* from the Popish books such passages as they deem it improper for their children to peruse; but where this occurs, is it not a direct disapprobation of what their "Church" *approves:* for *priests* to condemn—*in practice,* at least,—any destructive errors of their church is out of the question.

Our remarks on this important article of *auricular* confession have exceeded our usual limits; and as we are referred to texts of the Old Testament—which make no allusion to such a practice—we wish our Roman Catholic readers by all means to "search the scriptures." The reference to James, when the elders are to be called, is in cases where the penitents are sick; *but there is not one word of "confession to a priest."* "Confess your faults *one to another,* and pray for one another, that you may be healed," says St. James, in the chapter referred to: but "GOD forgiveth all thine iniquities," (Psal. ciii. 3.) *not a priest:* for "who can forgive but God alone?" (Mark ii. ver. 7.) "If we confess our sin, HE is faithful and just to forgive us our sins, and cleanse us from all unrighteousness." (1 John i. ver. 9.) Sins, we are repeatedly told, were confessed *openly,* but we are nowhere in the Scriptures commanded to confess them *privately to a priest:* and from these, *Protestants* are taught it is their greatest blessing to commune with the Almighty; and as Christians are commanded to do, they offer up a public acknowledgement of their unworthiness, as set forth in their liturgy.

The practice of *auricular confession* originated in the time

of the persecution of the early Christians, when they were compelled to meet in secret: at that period their pastors heard the confessions in these small assemblies, which led to the *abuse* of the *private* confessional in the fifth century. The practice was not determined until the council of Lateran, in the thirteenth century, under Innocent III.—it was confirmed by the council of Trent.

What do you mean by Extreme Unction?

You have both the full description and proof of it. James v. 14, 15. "Is any sick among you, let him call for the elders (πρεσβυτέρους, the priests) of the church, and let them pray over him, anointing him with oil in the name of the Lord: and the prayer of faith shall save the sick, and the Lord shall raise him up; and if he have committed sins, they shall be forgiven him."

What is Holy Orders?

A sacrament instituted by Christ, by which bishops, priests, &c. are consecrated to their respective functions, and receive grace to discharge them well,

When did Christ institute the sacrament of Holy Orders?

At his last supper, when he made his apostles priests, by giving them the power of consecrating the bread and wine into his body and blood, Luke xxii. 19, "Do this in remembrance of me." To which he added, after his resurrection, the power of forgiving the sins of the penitent, John xx. 22, 23.

What scripture proof have you that Holy Orders give grace to those that receive them worthily?

The words of St. Paul to Timothy, whom he had ordained priest by imposition of hands, 2 Tim. i. "Stir up the gift (τὸ χάρισμα) of God which is in thee by the putting on of my hands;" and 1 Tim. iv. 14. "Neglect not the gift that is in thee, which was given thee by prophecy, by the laying on of the hands of the presbytery."

It may, perhaps, strike our readers that the Church of Rome is always, as in the present case, much better able to give "a full description" of some minor ceremony, than of matters which, according to her own account, are actually necessary to salvation. Here are *eight* lines of scripture quoted on the subject of "Extreme Unction;" whilst for her *supremacy* she chiefly relies upon *two* ("thou art Peter, &c.). But let the pastor be called in, and let the oil be applied,—will Papists—in the very teeth of the scripture they

have quoted—deny that it is "the *prayer of faith*,"—and not the oil nor the priest—that "*shall save the sick?*" We have already shown (page 90) how necessary Protestants deem the presence of their Clergy upon such occasions; but they do not believe in consecrations as though they were *charms* as do the Romanists, and therefore they trust to GOD's mercy, to be obtained through their repentance and faith in HIM alone, rather than to the *opus operatum*, or works wrought, as taught by Popery*. Protestants believe only in *spiritual* means of grace, to be conferred by HIM who alone can bestow it; but let a Popish priest merely consecrate his own *night-cap*, and his penitent—the more ignorant, the more assured—would gladly envelope his head in it as a certain *means of grace*, and close his eyes for ever, *satisfied* of its *spiritual* efficacy. Strange as this assertion may appear to some of our readers, we repeat that it is *true;* let those who doubt it look to the *pontifical* which consists of the *forms* of *consecration* of almost every thing we can think of; as palms, ashes, oil, salt, water, bells, books, candles, old clothes,—even *children's napkins*, &c. &c. &c. The Protes-

* We have shown (*Note*, p. 85) the *veneration* in which Popery holds the *genuine* chrism of her own manufacture, even when compounded in England; but it cannot be denied that France possesses the *original* recipe. In the fifth century, Clovis was baptized by Remigius, Bishop of Rheims (hence deriving the title of "Most Christian King.") However, when they arrived at the font, the person intrusted with the "holy cream," with which the king was to be anointed, was missing. What was to be done?—Remigius prayed—and down flew a white dove, with a phial full of the oil tied round its neck; Clovis was anointed; and, from the same phial, all his successors, until 1793, when Philip Rhul, a member of the Convention, went to Rheims to preach the hatred of monarchy; and determining to destroy every thing he could, connected with it, he seized upon the *Sainte Ampoule*, or holy phial, —which was carefully deposited in the custody of the prior of Rheims,—and broke it in the public square, amidst the unsanctified shouts of "*Vive la République!*" It might have been supposed that thus ended the remaining stock-in-hand of this holy cream;—but miracles are miracles all the world over, and France was determined not to lose her papal patent. M. Suraine, we are told, a municipal officer, dipped the *point of a needle* into the phial before he delivered it to Rhul, and thus obtained a small (we should think *very* small) portion of the balsam; and although the latter picked up the fragments of the beatified bottle, and sent them to the Convention where they were destroyed, yet, it seems, he did not gather up every particle of it, and those particles which escaped him were collected by the "faithful" adherents of Popery; and which, with the portion saved by Suraine on the point of his needle, has increased to a quantity sufficient for the anointing fifty (Popish) princes.

tant believes that spiritual Grace can only be bestowed by the Holy Ghost, and therefore relies upon his God.

Holy orders, we are told, is a *sacrament* instituted by Christ: Christ *never did institute different sacraments for different orders of people;* and therefore we deny it to be a *sacrament* at all; it is an ordinance of the Church of Christ, of which the apostles set the example: (Titus i. 5.) "For this purpose I left thee in Crete, that thou shouldest set in order the things that *are wanting, and ordain elders* in every city as I had appointed thee." Had holy orders been a *sacrament* ordained by Christ at his last supper, how could it be "*wanting*" for half a century after his death?

We now turn to the Pope's *scriptural proofs* of what he has said; but we cannot understand how the words of our Saviour, "Do this in remembrance of me," can be interpreted into an institution of *holy orders?* What a religion must that be, which is ever under the miserable necessity of declaring that the scriptures mean the opposite of what they express; thus, indeed, making them "of none effect by the commandments of men."

Those who do their "*duty* in that state of life to which it has pleased God to call them," do it "worthily;" but we are not to make so great a *merit* of our *bare duties* as to *claim spiritual graces* for their performance, although such a correct attention to them in this world may be a means of assisting us to win those graces. Christ himself tells his disciples (Luke xvii. 10), "So, likewise, when ye shall have done all those things which are commanded you, say, we are *unprofitable servants;*—we have done that which was our *duty* to do." When Paul desires Timothy to "stir up the gift of God," &c. it is a proof that he *possessed* that gift; and, in the verse following, he says that God had given them the spirit of his power.—What proof is *this* of the *grace* of the Popish priests? The succeeding text quoted (1 Tim.) clearly expresses that, on Paul laying his hands upon him, he (Timothy) received the gift of prophetic revelation:—how

does *this* prove the *grace* of the Popish priests? We wish the Pope had given the *whole* of this chapter to the reading of his flock; it is the one from which we have already quoted (p. 82), in proof that those who *forbid to marry* and *command to abstain from meats*, speak *lies in hypocrisy*, and *teach the doctrines of devils.*

When was matrimony instituted?

It was first instituted by God Almighty, in Paradise, between our first parents; and this institution was confirmed by Christ in the new law (Matt. xix. 4, 5, 6), where he concludes, "What God hath joined together let no man put asunder."

How do you prove that matrimony is a sacrament?

Because it is a conjunction made and sanctified by God himself, and not to be dissolved by any power of man; as being a sacred sign, or mysterious representation of the indissoluble union of Christ and his Church (Ephes. v. 31, 32). "For this cause shall a man leave his father and mother, and shall be joined to his wife, and they two shall be one flesh. This is a great mystery (μυστήριον, a sacrament), but I speak concerning Christ and the Church,"—εἰς Χριστὸν καὶ εἰς τὴν ἐκκλησίαν, in Christ and in the Church.

Why does the Church not allow of the marriage of the clergy?

Because, upon their entering into holy orders, they make a vow or solemn promise to God and the Church to live continently: now the breach of such a vow as this would be a great sin; witness St. Paul (1 Tim. v. 11, 12), when speaking of widows that are for marrying after having made such a vow as this; he says, they "have damnation, because they have cast off their first faith," that is, their solemn engagement made to God.

But why does the Church receive none to holy orders but those that make this vow?

Because she does not think it proper that they, who by their office and functions ought to be wholly devoted to the service of God and the care of souls, should be diverted from these duties by the distractions of a married life. 1 Cor. vii. 32, 33. "He that is unmarried careth for the things that belong to the Lord, how he may please the Lord. But he that is married careth for the things that are of the world, how he may please his wife."

Why does the Church make use of so many ceremonies in administering the sacraments?

To stir up devotion in the people, and reverence to the sacred mysteries; to instruct the faithful concerning the effects and graces given by the sacraments; and to perform things relating to God's honour and the salvation of souls with a becoming decency.

Have you any warrant from Scripture for the use of such ceremonies?

Yes: we have the example of Christ, who frequently used the like ceremonies. For instance, in curing the man that was deaf and dumb, Mark vii. 33, 34. In curing him that was born blind, John ix. 6, 7. In breathing upon his apostles when he gave them the Holy Ghost, John xx. 22, &c.

We protest against marriage *as a sacrament*, although, had we the power, we would, in charity, confer it on the Popish clergy. People do not marry merely as fulfilling a duty towards God, but because it is their inclination, and sometimes because they deem it to be their interest or convenience to do so. The Pope's *proof* that it *is* a sacrament is as unfortunate as all his other proofs, when contrary to the written law from which he so equivocally quotes. When Christ said, "What therefore God hath joined together let no man put asunder;" it is, of course, to be understood as it is implied, that no person should make a breach between them. But the Pope need not have quoted from St. Paul (Ephes. v.), who himself quoted from CHRIST in the very chapter (Matt. xix.) at the 5th verse, to which we refer. But in this chapter Christ *does not say* that it is an institution "not to be dissolved *by any power of man;*" on the contrary (verse 9), "Whosoever shall put away his wife, *except it be for fornication*, and shall marry another, committeth adultery," &c.

But in the next paragraph we are told as a reason why the Popish Clergy do not marry, it is because they make a vow to God and their "Church" that they will *live continently*, and the breach of such an oath would be a great sin. This is the first "infallible" publication that ever deemed marriage an *incontinency!* Surely both the Pope and Doctor had forgotten that they had just admitted it was instituted by God himself in Paradise! But why *make* the vow? Christ says, swear not at all. Let us see what the Pope quotes:—"Because he that is unmarried careth for the things that

belong to the Lord, how he may please the Lord; he that is married careth for the things that are of the world," &c. In this text of St. Paul there is a *hiatus*, as usual: he leaves it for those to devote themselves wholly to God who may choose to do so, recommending to all not to bestow their anxieties on this world. The passage commences thus: "But I would have you without carefulness; he that is unmarried," &c. But, surely, the Pope might have found *other* passages of this very chapter not inapplicable to his subject? We will point them out:—

1 Cor. vii. v. 2.—"To avoid fornication let *every* man have *his own wife*, and every woman have her own husband." At v. 10, 11, we are informed that St. Paul commands by the Spirit of God when he forbids those who *are* married to put each other away; but what says he in reference to the subject of the Pope's extract? Why this:—

Verse 6.—"But I speak this *by permission*, and *not* of *commandment*."

12.—"But to the rest speak I, *not the Lord*," &c.

26.—"I *suppose*, therefore, that this is good," &c.

28.—"But, and *if thou marry thou hast not sinned*," &c.

Thus far as to the *negative proofs* of the Pope's solitary quotation from the Scriptures: those of the most positive authority, applicable to this part of our subject, are contained in almost every Gospel and Epistle of the New Testament, as well as in the books of the Old. A few examples, taken from the former will, we should suppose, be sufficient. St. Paul says,

Heb. xiii. v. 4.—"*Marriage is honourable* in ALL," &c.—(We have already shown where he says, *forbidding* to marry is a *doctrine of devils*.)

1 Pet. ch. iii.—[This *whole chapter* is addressed to husbands and wives on the duties of the married state.]

We will now show that marriage is not only "honourable

in ALL," but that it is enjoined to the *Clergy* in particular, in the most expressive manner. St. Paul says,

1 Tim. iii. v. 2.—"A bishop then must be blameless, the *husband of one wife*, vigilant, sober," &c.

Ver. 3.—"Not given to wine, no striker, not greedy of filthy lucre," &c.

4.—"One that ruleth well his own house, having *his children in subjection* with all gravity."

5.—"(For if a man know not how to rule his own house, how shall he take care of the CHURCH of GOD ?)"

6.—"*Not a novice*, lest being lifted up with pride he fall into the condemnation of the devil."—[This Apostle gives similar directions how ministers should be qualified, to Titus, ch. i.]—"Have we not power to lead about a sister,—a *wife*, as well as the *other Apostles*, and as the *brethren of our Lord* and *Cephas?*"—1 Cor. ix. 5.

We know not how any person who could read, could, by possibility, misunderstand the above commands of the Apostle, unless a Popish miracle had been wrought upon him, and had deprived him of the use of his senses. We have shown wherein the Church of Rome has, in her "Profession of Faith," made considerable additions to Christianity; and surely denying (what *she* calls *a sacrament of grace*) to her Clergy is a great substraction from it, and which must leave her pastors by so much the more *graceless* than her laity. Christ himself makes marriage the type of heaven, calling himself the bridegroom, and the church his spouse.

Some readers may, perhaps, imagine that Popery, when her power was not quite so limited as at present, had other views than those of devotion in prohibiting the marriage of her Clergy: it certainly added both to her wealth and domination; her *Canon Law** not permitting her regular bishops to dispose of their estates by *will*, the Pope thus became the

* *Decret. Gregor. lib.* 3. *de Testam. cap.* 7, 9.

holy treasurer of his Church :—as a matter of *conscience*, we have already given our scriptural proofs. St. John was the *only* "virgin Apostle," St. Paul himself having been married*, as the ancient Fathers say. But with the Scriptures before us, all other authorities are, at best, but secondary ; and from *these* we learn, as above, that the Apostles were married—a practice followed by the clergy in the purest ages of Christianity. The Douay Catechism teaches that " a wilful transgression in matter of weight against any known commandment of the " Church," or of some lawful superior, is a *mortal* sin, which deprives the soul of her spiritual life;" among the *deadly* sins are pride, sloth, &c. Fornication is but a *venial* sin in the Church of Rome, and which, when her priests are *publicly discovered* to have committed—(no easy matter if they act with any degree of caution)—they are excused by their *opus operatum*—a slight penance, perhaps, or removed (to save scandal) to some other district; but let them enter into " holy matrimony," and they would be degraded and anathematized. Thus is the sin we have named tolerated, if not allowed†, by the Romish Church, and for which reason it is distinguished in the *Protestant* Liturgy as a *deadly* sin. But *wherefore* is it deemed a less sin than marriage? Because the first is *only* a breach of the commandment of God—the second evinces a disobedience to the command of the Pope!

The origin of this affectation of unnatural celibacy first took its rise from the enthusiasm of those of the Christians who, in their zeal for the religion they professed, forgot the pure doctrines of Christ, in neglecting the duties of their worldly state, to perform works of supererogation. Nothing, however, so preposterous as *forcing* a great body of young fellows into a state of celibacy—and *empowering* them to

---

* See Ignatius, Clemens, Eusebius, Ambrose, &c., quoted by all ecclesiastical writers on this subject.

† *Gloss. ad Gratian. Dist.* 82, *c.* 5.

resist their own inclination to act otherwise in the midst of temptation—was ever thought of until many ages afterwards. Our Saxon minister, Dunstane, who turned Monk, crowned Edmund, and was afterwards made a saint of—he, at the council of Calne (Wilts), about the year 997, publicly harangued the nobles, monks, and priests against the marriage of the clergy; but so ineffectually, that he (as he had done upon other occasions) found it necessary to work a *miracle** to enforce his doctrine. The floor fell in with all his opponents, he having first taken care to stand upon a plank which he had not previously ordered to be loosened. But it was reserved to the notorious Hildebrand, the Monk of Clugny, after he became Pope, under the title of Gregory VII., to insist on this unscriptural tenet in the latter end of the *eleventh* century; but which decree was not attended to by the clergy of England, until about a century afterwards. This ambitious tyrant, (now a *Saint!)* who openly assumed a *temporal* power over *all princes*, had his own reasons for condemning marriage in his clergy rather than crimes forbidden by Christ. He was the *director* of MATHILDA, Countess of Tuscany, who, in consequence, separated from her husband; and, as a reward for his spiritual instruction, at her death bequeathed to him her immense possessions†. After the prohibition of marriage, the clergy became one living mass of impurity; giving a loose to their depravity with the most unblushing impudence. Æneas Sylvius afterwards Pope Pius II. (after the *holy* council of Constance, which burned John Huss, and Jerome, of Prague), shamelessly avowed the scandal of his Church, by stating that the sin of fornication "was an old fault; that he was no better than David or Solomon, and that *he knew not one* who was free from it." We are not about to write a treatise on the

* See Turner's Hist. of the Anglo-Saxons.

† Cardinal Benno, who lived in this Popedom, was at enmity with Gregory, and therefore what *he* says of him is liable to distrust. (What he says of the seven preceding Pontiffs is not calculated to raise Popish infallibility very highly among civilized Papists.) *See Mosheim, and the numerous Roman Catholic writers therein quoted upon this subject.*

crimes of Popes ; they are handed down to us by the Popish writers themselves. We have merely shown that men who, as Pope Pius says (p. 102), "by their office and functions ought to be wholly devoted" to a more worthy service, by affecting celibacy, never were so, and never can be. In our own days, however "*distracting*" a married life might be to a Roman Catholic Priest, we should think, with all deference, that it could scarcely exceed the tumult of *public meetings*, &c. &c., in which we find them constantly engaged? Although *wives* might pout, yet do not *politicians* declaim; and, whether laical or clerical, enjoin *perseverance* in attaining a political object? And though *infants* might cry, still we can scarcely think it would *more* distract the thoughts of pious priests, than the howling of incendiaries over the cabins of heretics they have destroyed? *

The reasons assigned in the two last paragraphs of this chapter we think very lame indeed. The innumerable ceremonies of the Romish Church are employed, it is said, "to stir up devotion,"—and certainly a very bustling *stir* they make. Is crying to a block of wood or marble, thumping the breast, kissing the hem of a priest's robe, dressing and undressing of priests at the altar, sprinkling, crossing, genuflexions, &c. &c. &c., are all these, and a hundred other ceremonies necessary to "*decency*," "GOD's *honour*," or the "*salvation of souls?*" Rather say, the theatrical repre-

* Although we have not said, nor intend to say, that every Romish priest is not a perfect Joseph, it must not be inferred that we could not prove to the contrary—maugre infallibility!—Gandolphy, however, who was a Popish priest, speaks thus of himself and brethren, in a *holy* composition of Sermons (Vol. iv. p. 112), in all *humility:* the Romish priest, he says, "Walks among men *a miracle of grace*—is *the rock* that *pours forth water to the fainting*—the *manna that yields bread to the hungry.*" The humble pastor thus proceeds:—"My brethren, to the *reflecting* mind this ministry must, surely, present something *divinely sacred*, and appears more *worthy the nature of angels than of men?* It exalts them above all for which human life has designed them—makes them the agents of God, the vicegerents of Jesus Christ, and the SAVIOURS OF MEN! In this point of view it ranks them even ABOVE the ANGELIC SPIRITS, and *clothes them with the divine character* of the MESSIAH HIMSELF!!!". This *holy* composition, consisting of four volumes, was declared by the late Pope Pius VII., to be worthy of being "cased in cedar and gold." But Gandolphy's holiness at length *fell off*, since a few years ago he was publicly censured by his anathematizing *Mother* in Spanish Place Chapel.

sentation of a high mass is calculated to appeal to the external senses of Papists, who are on such occasions permitted to use them until the consecration of the host:—but *then* the person who serves at the mass is ordered to ring a bell as loudly as he can: this is the signal for *ultra* devotion,—the "faithful" then yield up their sober faculties to fanaticism —*then* is *Reason* completely dethroned, and, instead of a fervent heart offered up to God with "a zeal according to knowledge," (Rom. x. ii.), the very essence of Christianity is lost in the blandishments of Popish superstition!—Is not this TRUE to the very letter?—Nay, as the bell is rung more loudly, so to the more ardent partaker in these "mysteries," even respiration appears to become difficult and painful: those who have ever witnessed these ceremonies can confirm our testimony *. The last paragraph of this chapter tells us, that in her extravagant exhibitions, Popery follows "*the example of Christ, who* FREQUENTLY *used* THE LIKE CEREMONIES"! We are referred to Mark and John to find these proofs; let our readers contrast them:—

Mark vii. 33, 34. "And he took him [one who was deaf and dumb] aside from the multitude, and put his fingers into his ears, and he spit and touched his tongue: and, looking up to heaven, he *sighed* and saith unto him, '*Ephphatha*,' that is, Be opened."

John ix. 6, 7. "When he had thus spoken, he spat on the ground, and made clay of the spittle, and he anointed the eyes of the blind man with the clay; and said unto him, Go, wash in the pool of Siloam (which is, by interpretation, *Sent*). He went his way therefore, and washed, and came seeing."

John xx. 22. "And when he had said this *he breathed on them*, and said unto them, Receive ye the Holy Ghost."

---

* "The Greeks and Latins seem to have agreed, in the *darker ages*, that the essence and life of RELIGION consisted in image-worship: in honouring dead saints, in collecting relics, in enriching the 'Church,' and other *such* exertions of *piety*." *Mosheim*, v. ii. p. 417.—Popery may truly boast that she has not changed in *these* respects.

Such were the "*ceremonies*" of Christ—those of Popery are to be seen every day. Our Saviour showed that his spittle—the very dust that HE mingled with it—possessed a miraculous power: let us see similar effects proceed from the ceremonies of Popery, and we will believe in her (at present) arrogant and impious assertions.

Such are Popish proofs and Protestant refutation of there having been *seven* sacraments ordained by our Lord. They were never received by our Anglo-Saxon ancestors, nor was *that number* decided upon until so agreed by the council of Trent, only between two and three hundred years ago. Bishop Hall tells us that such a number had never been even *heard* of until Hugo de Victoire contended for it in the twelfth century.*

CHAP. IV.—OF THE REAL PRESENCE AND TRANSUBSTANTIATION.

What is the doctrine of the Catholic Church in relation to this article?

We believe and profess, that in the most holy sacrament of the Eucharist, there is truly, really, and substantially the body and blood, together with the soul and divinity of our Lord Jesus Christ. And that there is a conversion (or change) of the whole substance of the bread into his body, and of the whole substance of the wine into his blood; which conversion (or change) the Catholic Church calls transubstantiation.

What proofs have you for this?

1st. Matt. xxvi. 26. "As they were eating, Jesus took bread and blessed it, and brake it, and gave it to the disciples, and said, Take, eat; THIS IS MY BODY. And he took the cup, and gave thanks, and gave it to them, saying, Drink ye all of it. FOR THIS IS MY BLOOD OF THE NEW TESTAMENT WHICH IS SHED FOR MANY FOR THE REMISSION OF SINS."—Mark xiv. 22, 24. "Take, eat; This is my body—This is my blood of the New Testament which is shed for many." Luke xxii. 19. "This is my body which is given for you: this do in remembrance of me—This cup is the New Testament in my blood which is shed for you." 1 Cor. xi. 24, 25. "Take, eat; This is my body which is broken for you—This cup is the New Testament in my blood." Which words of Christ, repeated in so many places, cannot be verified, without offering violence to the text, any

* See also Stillingfleet, v. vi.

other way than by a real change of the bread and wine into his body and blood.

2dly, 1 Cor. x. 16. "The cup of blessing which we bless, is it not the communion of the blood of Christ? The bread which we break, is it not the communion of the body of Christ?" Which interrogation of the Apostle is certainly equivalent to an affirmation; and evidently declares, that in the blessed Sacrament we really receive the body and blood of Christ.

3dly, 1 Cor. xi. 27, 29. "Whosoever shall eat this bread or drink the cup of the Lord unworthily, shall be GUILTY OF THE BODY AND BLOOD OF THE LORD—He that eateth and drinketh unworthily, eateth and drinketh damnation to himself, NOT DISCERNING THE BODY OF OUR LORD." Now, how should a person be "guilty of the body and blood of our Lord," by receiving unworthily; if what he received were only bread and wine, and not "the body and blood of our Lord?" Or where should be the crime of "not discerning the body of our Lord," if the "body of our Lord" were not there?

4thly, John vi. 51, &c. "The bread that I will give is my flesh, which I will give for the life of the world. The Jews, therefore, strove amongst themselves, saying, How can this man give us his flesh to eat? Then Jesus said unto them, Verily, verily, I say unto you, except ye eat the flesh of the Son of man, and drink his blood, ye have no life in you. Whosoever eateth my flesh, and drinketh my blood, hath eternal life, and I will raise him up at the last day. FOR MY FLESH IS MEAT INDEED, AND MY BLOOD IS DRINK INDEED. He that eateth my flesh, and drinketh my blood, dwelleth in me, and I in him. As the living Father hath sent me, and I live by the Father; so he that eateth me, even he shall live by me. This is that bread which came down from heaven, not as your fathers did eat manna and are dead: he that eateth of this bread shall live for ever."

Hence the *Protestants*, in their catechism in the Common Prayer-Book, are forced to acknowledge, "that the body and blood of Christ are verily and indeed taken and received by the faithful in the Lord's Supper." Now, how that can be *verily and indeed taken and received*, which is not *verily and indeed* there, is a greater mystery than transubstantiation.

> The literal sense is hard to flesh and blood;
> But nousense never can be understood.
> DRYDEN'S *Hind and Panther.*

Are we not commanded, Luke xxii. 19, *to receive the Sacrament in remembrance of Christ?*

Yes, we are: and St. Paul. 1 Cor. xi. 26, lets us know what it is that is to be the object of our remembrance when we receive, when he tells us "Ye do show (or show forth) the Lord's death till he come." But this remembrance is no ways opposite to the real presence of Christ's body and blood: on the contrary, what better remembrance

can there be of Christ's death and passion, than to receive under the sacramental veils the same body and blood in which he suffered for us.

Why, then, do you blame Protestants for taking this Sacrament in remembrance of Christ?

We do not blame them for taking it in *remembrance* of him; but we blame them for taking it as a *bare remembrance*, so as to exclude the reality of his body and blood. That is, we blame them for taking the *remembrance* and leaving out the substance; whereas the words of Christ require that they should acknowledge both.

But how is it possible that the Sacrament should contain the real body and blood of Christ?

Because nothing is impossible to the ALMIGHTY; and it is the highest rashness, not to say blasphemy, for poor worms of the earth to dispute the power of God.

We have already observed that there is nothing contained in the doctrines of Christianity which is opposed to human reason; and reason must ever be our surest guide in elucidating fact. By reason alone we are assured of the most important of all truths, since it is this "lamp of God" which lights us to our Maker; and which it is the chief business of Popery to extinguish, to save herself from the scorn of those whom she has ever led in darkness. The millions who have reasoned and believed, have done so because TRUTH led them to conviction; but how few of those who do not believe—how very few of these have troubled themselves upon scriptural matters at all; and what the generality of such *call reasoning* is either a repetition of what they have heard others say, as little acquainted with the subject as themselves: or, perhaps, an opinion formed from the perusal of some few pages of a deistical writer, without the slightest reference to the Scriptures! An attentive perusal of the sacred writings is neither calculated to make people Papists nor Deists: in these the former meet with nothing of Popery; and the most learned of the latter dare not deny the truth of our Saviour's prophecies *even* when effected by a miracle*.

* Gibbon, in speaking of the vain attempt of the apostate Julian to rebuild the Temple of Jerusalem, says, "the enterprise was defeated, perhaps, by a *preternatural* event."—Gib. Hist. vol. ii. p. 388-9. The humiliation and dispersion of the Jews is a fact which the most inveterate unbeliever is compelled to admit.

Reason—even human reason—with all its failings, is our only true guide, let popish schoolmen dispute it as they may. As our reason tells us there is a SUPREME POWER, so does it assure us that there must be many things in the very *nature* of that power which we do not—cannot—comprehend, *because* HE is INFINITE and INCOMPREHENSIBLE: these we take upon the *Revelation* of them as given in the holy Scriptures; which reason tells us it would be as *foolish* to deny as the previous existence of men whose works we have not read, or of kingdoms now no more, which we have not seen. Reason tells us, that in speaking of the TRINITY, the INCARNATION, &c. the Scriptures must speak in a language adapted to our *capacities:* thus, when we read of *three persons,* we are not to measure the *nature* of the SUPREME by *our own;* and to think that, because Matthew, Mark, and Luke were three men, the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost must be three Gods? When God is said to have *repented, grieved,* &c., the prophets could not have more expressively shown how great was the sin of a wicked people than by the application of such terms as were most familiar to the understanding of those whom they addressed. Sin must be ever offensive to God; and although by his breath he could scatter worlds, in what terms could we comprehend the consequences of our own evil actions more clearly than by a denunciation of HIS *wrath,* HIS *anger,* &c.? In short, it is as impossible for us to believe in TRUTH without our understanding, as to distinguish colour without our sight. The blind man may believe a thing to be blue or green, because he has been always told it was so; and so he would believe were it black or white. He who possesses the means of distinguishing the one from the other relies upon the evidence of his own senses. Popish infallibility alone denies the right of an examination of the most essential truths; yet, according to her own doctrine of this self-assumed attribute, the Turk, Gentoo, or Esquimaux, must be equally correct in his religious profes-

sions. "I will hear of no examination of any scriptural truths, since *mine* is an *infallible* belief," says the Papist—"Neither will I," says each of the others, "for so have *I* been taught to consider *mine*, nor will I *inquire*, but *believe*." The *lamp of God* (Prov. xx. v. 27) must be extinguished by them all, or they (supposing all to have the opportunity) would examine for themselves; and did they so, Reason is the surest, and consequently the safest, guide that could direct them. Nor is it unfair to suppose that the Papist, Turk, or Esquimaux, after an attentive perusal of the Scriptures, would place infallibility in the Godhead where it is only due, and that the former would reject the impiety of *creating* his CREATOR, and of afterwards (by what he is taught to call an "unbloody sacrifice") quaffing his real blood and grinding with his teeth that which is declared to be his *real flesh!* Reason, at least, is opposed to such impious rites. Those who adhere to them (however learned they be) merely because they have been so taught, appeal not to Reason, but solely rely upon the prejudices of their education. Truth would be Truth still, although the whole world departed from her; but her celestial light can never illuminate the fanatic who is ready to swear he is "*infallible*." Throughout the whole Bible there is no one thing said or done by the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, which contradicts the evidence even of any of our external senses—to these the *miracles* of Christ and the Apostles appeal. Reason tells us that, had they been forgeries, the enemies of Christianity would have gladly disproved them. To believe in the doctrine of Transubstantiation, we must yield up sight, smell, taste, &c. &c. However, we profess to draw *all* our proofs from the Scriptures; and if these do not *disprove* Transubstantiation, we will readily admit it.

It must be confessed that the Pope has, on the present occasion, quoted more extensively than usual from the sacred volume; it has hitherto been our complaint that he has

adduced so small a portion of Scripture in proof of his assertions; and now that he has found so many lines, as his Church thinks, in favour of her own favourite tenet—Transubstantiation, still, we are disposed to be displeased with his misapplication of them. In the first paragraph we are given to understand that a little *flour, water,* and *wine,* "is *truly, really,* and *substantially the body* and *blood, together with the soul* and *divinity* of our LORD JESUS CHRIST !!!—If Popery can prove this by the Scriptures, we will be the first to admit that the performance of the most absolute impossibility is, with her, a mere matter-of-course accomplishment. Although in the extracts from Scripture a reference to the *Epistles* is (we know not wherefore) scattered among the *Gospels,* we will apply ourselves first (to save unnecessary discussion) to the latter—the first three of which we take altogether, since the Pope—as it were, to make a *show of proof*—has, with a most Jesuitical craft, extracted the passages alluded to from the three Evangelists as stated by *each* when *speaking of the same subject,* viz., the Last Supper. The sum of these expressions is, that, as our Saviour gave the Apostles the bread and wine, he said, "this is my body—this is my blood of the *New* Testament which is shed for many." It is the belief of all Christians that the prefigurations of the old law were the types which were to be fulfilled in Christ; and thus was the Passover of the Jews a typical representation which our Saviour fulfilled, using the same form of words which had been pronounced by the Jews,—instead of "*This is the Paschal Lamb which was slain for us in Egypt;*" he said, "This is my body which is given *for you.*" When Moses sprinkled the blood, he used this form as repeated by St. Paul, (Heb. ix. 20) "This is the blood of the Testament which God hath enjoined you,"—instead of the *Old Testament.* Christ said, "This is my blood of the *New Testament,*"—and which was thus rendered easy and familiar to

his Apostles; who, although they had declared some things they had heard from their Divine Master, "hard sayings," yet they expressed no astonishment at these words of Christ; but which, if they had understood them to mean *Transubstantiation*—is it unfair to ask—would they not have expressed? If they were not to believe that the bread and wine which they saw and tasted *was* bread and wine, but to have given up all their senses at once, they could not have been sure that it was Christ himself who addressed them! But, contrary to the evidence of fact, let us suppose for a moment, that they *had* believed that Christ spoke in a positive rather than a spiritual sense; they could not have remained in the error *two minutes*, since, in the verses following those referred to in the "Grounds of Faith," our Saviour most clearly explains to them the meaning of the figure he had used. As neither the Pope nor the Doctor appear to have read the chapters *throughout*, from which they have quoted so liberally, we will also extract a verse or two from these same chapters, which it is obvious they have overlooked! The Pope's extract is from Matt. xxvi. 26, 27, and 28—we beg to add the 29th, "But I say unto you I will not *drink henceforth* of the *fruit of the vine*, until that day when I drink it *new* with you in my Father's Kingdom." Does Popery wish it to be understood by this text that CHRIST had *drunk his own blood?* It will not, we suppose, be denied that Christ and the Apostles partook of the same beverage? St. Mark is next quoted; but as our Saviour's expressions, as they relate to the "*fruit of the vine*," are stated in the very words of St. Matthew, we need not repeat them: this is the case also with St. Luke, who not only, as the Pope tells us, gives the words that the bread and wine were to be taken in *remembrance* of Christ; but that (v. 15.) Christ said, "With desire I have desired to *eat this passover with you* before I suffer." Popery, we presume, will not object to a *part* of the extracts given above

being *figurative;* as, "This *cup* is the New Testament in my blood which *is* shed for you."—These are the words of institution.—She dare not say they are *not* figurative, since the *cup* did not represent the BLOOD of our LORD, which had not *then* been shed?—Again, if the elements were to lose their nature; how was it they were *called bread* and *wine after* consecration? The next passage is from 1 Cor. xi. v. 24, 25,—but before we pay it further attention, *why*, we ask, is the paragraph from the 10th chapter put *between* the verses of the 11th? Is it to divide the sense of the *whole* chapter into particles—to make a *show* by many relations of the same narrative, or both of these? We will notice the *whole chapter* (11th,) which treats on "Profaning the Lord's Supper;" and in which St. Paul condemns the Corinthians for their irregularity of conduct, when they went to partake of it; where one would be hungry and another drunken, (v. 21.) He then tells them expressly how they were to take the bread (v. 24.) in *remembrance* of Christ; and that the wine (v. 25.) was to be taken in *remembrance* of our Saviour, *also*. The Pope has partially quoted the parts which he thought would best suit him, and asks, "How could he be guilty of the body and blood of the Lord if these were not substantially in the cup?" We might answer, just in the same manner as those were guilty of it for upwards of *twelve hundred years*, until Pope Innocent first commanded that the real presence *should* be in the cup. But this is not our way of reasoning—"He that eateth and drinketh unworthily eateth and drinketh damnation to himself, not discerning the body of our Lord," says the Apostle: and that the texts quoted upon this subject should be the more effective with those not permitted to look into the Gospel, they are distinguished by the Pope by CAPITAL LETTERS: He who "eateth and drinketh unworthily," we believe, most certainly, does so to his own condemnation;*

* Protestants do not understand the ill consequences of even partaking in the

(our 28th Church Article clearly expresses it)—not discerning the *spiritual* gift in the cup—the body and blood of Christ, which are received and eaten through the medium of *faith*. But, says the Pope, "where should be the crime of not discerning the body of our Lord, if the body of our Lord were not there?" As Popery will have *discerning* (which we should have understood as not acknowledging the spiritual efficacy) in the vulgar sense, *seeing*, we must beg some Romish priest who *has seen* anything more than a wafer and some wine in the chalice at the time of consecration, just to be so kind as to inform us *what other appearance* it was to which it *changed?* We have read of the Popish priest who first made the *discovery* of transubstantiation, seeing the elements he had consecrated *change into the figure of a child*, (we choose so to express it—*he* spoke more impiously,) —if the miracle still continues, we must confess our ignorance—we really were not conscious of it.

We now come to the long extract from John, when relating a different circumstance to that which the three other Evangelists had previously told. However, it is evident that there are many portions of this chapter that the Pope and Doctor have also overlooked, although it will not be denied that they are applicable to the subject in hand. It has been seen by the Pope's extract that Christ frequently calls the bread his flesh—it commences at the 51st verse of the sixth chapter. It was scarcely worth while, we should think, to *leave out* the first two lines of this verse, because they clearly express what *kind* of bread our Saviour declared himself to be—bread which infidelity must admit could not be *made by human hands*. The verse commences thus:—"I *am the* LIVING BREAD which came DOWN FROM HEAVEN; if any man

holy sacrament without a proper examination of conscience, as meriting ETERNAL *condemnation;* but as St. Paul has explained them in the verses immediately following those selected by the Pope:—"For this cause many are weak and sickly among you, and many sleep, (*i. e.* are dead.) For if we would judge ourselves, we should not be judged. But when we are judged, we are chastened of the Lord, that we should *not be condemned* with the world,"—(1 Cor. ch. xi. v. 30, 31, 32.)

eat of *this* bread he shall live for ever: and the bread that I will give," &c. Is Popery prepared to say that Christ, being in himself the "*living* bread," intended his Apostles to tear his human flesh with their teeth? But at once, to place the point beyond dispute, as far as the Scriptures are concerned, we will take up the subject at the exact verse where the Pope and the Doctor dropt it:—

Ver. 58. This is that bread which came down from heaven; *not* as your fathers did *eat manna* and are dead: he that eateth of this bread shall live for ever.

Ver. 59. These things said he in the synagogue as he taught in Capernaum.

Ver. 60. Many, therefore, of his disciples, when they had heard this, said, this is an hard saying, who can *hear it?*

Ver. 61. When Jesus knew in himself that his disciples murmured at it, he said unto them, doth this offend you?

Ver. 63. *It is the* SPIRIT *that* QUICKENETH, the FLESH PROFITETH NOTHING; the *words that I speak* unto you *they are* SPIRIT and THEY ARE LIFE.

And now, we ask, is not this *explanation* of Christ himself explicit and satisfactory to all Christians permitted to use their reason? It is by applying figurative expressions in a positive sense, and insisting upon realities being no more than figures, which has reduced Popery herself to the contemptible figure she appears, where mankind, bursting her spells, look her in the face, and behold her as she *really is*—one livid mass of corruption. All doctrines under the guise of Christianity, when opposed to the Scriptures, are corrupt, as those very Scriptures teach us to believe; and whilst we peruse and believe in these it is impossible that we can believe in Popery.

"The *Protestants*," says the Pope, "are forced to acknowledge that the body and blood of Christ are verily and indeed taken," &c. By what power were they *forced* to this

acknowledgement, which we must beg to observe they *never denied?* It was the power of *Reason* which *forced* them. Reason still convinces them of the genuineness and of the authenticity of the Scriptures: from these they learn what their Saviour taught, and that it is their bounden duty to obey His institutions *as* He *himself ordained them to be believed,* unmixed with the superstitions introduced by the zealot, the designing, and the wicked. It is the Doctor, we presume, who has so *wittily* said, "how that can be verily and indeed taken and received which is not verily and indeed there, is a greater mystery than transubstantiation." We readily yield him all the benefit to which the witticism is entitled; merely observing, by the way, that Christ having said, as above, that "*it* is the SPIRIT that *quickeneth*—the FLESH *profiteth nothing*," by HIS word we believe that his SPIRITUAL BODY and BLOOD are verily and indeed in the cup, and which we verily and indeed take and receive. Perhaps we may meet with an applicable *distich* by the time we arrive at the next chapter, this being a long one.

The two succeeding paragraphs are written in *proof* that the best remembrance of our Lord's death is by the mastication of his real body, and that Protestants are in error for protesting against so unscriptural, so horrible a rite. But it is to the last sentence of the fulsome chapter to which we call the particular attention of our readers. The question is asked, "But how is it possible that the Sacrament should contain the real body and blood of Christ?" To this it is replied, "Because nothing is impossible to the ALMIGHTY; and it is the highest rashness, not to say blasphemy, for poor worms of the earth to dispute the power of GOD!" If this application be not blasphemy, we really know not what is! Is it meet for "poor worms of the earth" thus to affect the possession of God's power? God expressly says he speaks of the SPIRIT; by what power then, save the power of Evil, does Popery dare to oppose HIS word, and insist upon her

followers believing that they eat HIMSELF!!! Because nothing but sin is impossible to God, are the sinful "worms of the earth" to insist upon the adoption of their own guilty theorems, and declare it blasphemy to doubt them? Is the sacred name of our MAKER to be thus profaned upon every occasion that guilt seeks to hide *her own acts* because nothing is impossible to HIM? Thus it is that the crimes of Popery are ever sought to be vindicated. The sanguinary deeds of the midnight murderer are sanctioned by Popery, (where she has the *power* of doing so)—and the blood-stained assassin is protected by her Church, who, with maternal affection, remits his atrocities, "because nothing is impossible to God*!"

We have already said, and again repeat it, that since heaven and earth were first created, the Almighty never did, nor said, any thing contrary to our own senses; since any such words or acts would have destroyed our *certainty* of anything and everything else whatsoever.

Having noticed the extracts adduced by the Pope, we will here submit a few observations of our own. If Papists were told of a people, calling themselves Christians, who believed that the REAL PRESENCE was contained in a *door*, which they first worshipped, and afterwards cut up and ate—if they were to hear of others who declared the body and blood of Christ were in a *stick*, which was adored and eaten—if Papists heard of a third race, who insisted that the Apostles and Disciples

---

* "Every Roman Pontiff," says Mosheim, (vol. i. p. 455, Eng. Transl.) "added something NEW to the ancient rites and institutions, [of his Church,] as if it was an essential mark of their zeal for religion, and of their pious discharge of the ministerial function, to divert the multitude with new shows and new spectacles of devout mummery." But Boniface V. determined to render his name notorious by a more atrocious *reality*:—He it was who passed the law which afforded *sanctuary* to every criminal who sought refuge within the walls of his "Church"; a law which "gave a loose rein to the licentiousness of the most abandoned profligates." When these sanctuaries were abolished in Malta by the English, a few years since, the good people of that island murmured that their "*rights*" were abrogated! Papists, however, ought not to have complained of this *hardship*. The late Pius VII. did all he could to keep them as enthralled and ignorant as even paganism could desire. In 1814 he restored the Jesuits: in 1817, he published a Bull against the Bible Societies.

were all *really* and *truly bread*—and of a fourth, who preached they were *salt*, &c.—would they not exclaim against the *superstition* and *idolatry* of the worshippers, as they do now when speaking of the Heathens? Undoubtedly, we say, they would; and wherefore? Simply because it is not the *kind* of idolatry which Popery commands them to practise themselves; since, in the Scriptures, the above figures of speech are used, and are as plainly expressed, as that which she has insisted upon being a reality. Christ says, "I am the *door*," &c.; "I am the *vine*," &c.; and to the Apostles, "Ye are the *salt* of the earth," &c. St. Paul says, (in the very next verse to that quoted by the Pope as above, but which escaped his notice, until he wanted otherwise to apply it,) 1 Cor. ch. x. ver. 17, "We being many are *one bread* and *one body*, for we are *all partakers* of that one bread."

It is not unworthy of remark, that where the bread is called *flesh*, Popery herself admits it to be so very plain, that she insists upon it *literally;* but when, in the *sacrament*, bread is *called* bread, it appears so very *obscure*, that, in her infallibility, she declares it to be merely *figurative*. This is what may be termed *the "MYSTERY"* of *elucidating into confusion*.

We have said nothing of *substance* and *accident* in the course of our observations; but as scent is the accident of a rose, remove the substance, and no accident remains: now we ask, when, in the sacrament, the bread and wine are *changed*, what becomes of their accidents? The colour, &c. *seen* can no longer be of bread and wine, nor does Popery admit that they can be the accidents of the body and blood of Christ. (*Catechis. ad Paroch. de Eucharist. Sacram. Sect.* 25, xliv.) We merely ask for information on this subject, not knowing to *what* the accidents belong; or if, by *any accident*, the accidents visible in the cup, *after* consecration, are to be *supposed really* and *truly no accidents at all?* We should also wish to know—as the body of our Lord can

never decay—if the contents of the cup, *after* consecration, would turn sour if left in the sun?

We could say much upon the subject of the Papal consecration of wafers, &c., as it stands in their own rubrics, and of the accidents "or mischances" by which they become non-effective; as, of any other than wheaten flour being used for the bread—if sour grapes are in the wine—if there be a wafer more than the Priest had counted for consecration (because the *intention* only going with the lesser number, it could not be known *which* of these were or were not consecrated,—if a mouse should nibble any of them—if the ingredients of the cup should disagree with the Priest, who, in such a case—if it *be not nauseous* (very well put in), must *reverently* ——! But we will content ourselves with stating the *origin* of Transubstantiation.

The first of whom we hear that preached this "mystery" was Pascasius Radbert (afterwards Abbot of Corbey), and the most contemptible legends were produced in its support, whilst it was attacked and disproved* by Bertramm, Johannes Scotus, and many others. In the 11th century it was thoroughly exposed to contempt by Berenger†, &c. As, however, from the first admission and defence of this doctrine by some of the members of the Church of Rome, who felt that *such* a doctrine would more firmly establish her power, it had caused continual disputes; and in the year 1215, at the fourth Lateran Council, "that imperious pontiff, Innocent III., *without deigning to consult anybody* (although a *prodigious* number of ecclesiastics were present), published no less than *seventy laws* or decrees, by which not only the authority of the Pope and the power of the Clergy were confirmed and extended, but also *new doctrines* or *articles* of *faith* were *imposed upon Christians*. ..... It was reserved for Innocent to put an

---

* Mosheim. † Ibid.

end to the liberty which every Christian had hitherto enjoyed, of interpreting this presence in the manner he thought most agreeable to the declarations of Scripture, and to decide in favour of the most monstrous doctrine that the phrenzy of Superstition was capable of inventing. This audacious Pontiff pronounced the opinion that is embraced at this day in the Church of Rome relating to that point, to be the *only true* and *orthodox* account of the matter; and he had the *honour* of *introducing* and *establishing* the use of the term *Transubstantiation*, which was hitherto absolutely *unknown*.*"

We will make no apology for the length of our extracts or remarks in the course of this chapter: it is a most important subject, and which we leave to the consideration of our readers.

CHAP. V.—OF COMMUNION IN ONE KIND.

What is the doctrine of the Church as to this point?

We profess, "that under either kind alone Christ is received whole and entire, and a true sacrament."

What proof have you for this?

Because, as we have seen in the foregoing chapter, the bread, by consecration, is truly and really changed into the body of Christ, and the wine into his blood: now both faith and reason tell us, that the living body of the Son of God cannot be without his blood, nor his blood without his body; nor his body and blood without his soul and divinity. It is true he shed his blood for us in his passion, and his soul at his death was parted from his body; but now he has risen from the dead immortal and impassible, and can shed his blood no more, nor die any more. "Christ being raised from the dead," says the apostle, Rom. vi. 9, "dieth no more; death hath no more dominion over him." Therefore whosoever receives the body of Christ, receives Christ himself whole and entire; there is no receiving him by parts.

But does not Christ say, John vi. 53, "Except ye eat the flesh of the Son of Man, and drink his blood, ye have no life in you?"

---

* Mosheim, ut supra. See also Cowell's Account of the present State of the Greek Church, referred to by Dr. Maclaine. This writer was at Constantinople towards the latter end of the 17th century, where the Jesuits used every means of *bribing* the indigent Bishops of the Greek Church *to obtain their assent to their own false assertion*, that "*Transubstantiation* had been practised in the Eastern Churches." These bribes had the desired effect of obtaining signatures, which, Mosheim says, were afterwards invalidated as having been obtained by the artifice of the Jesuits.

True. But according to the Catholic doctrine we do this, though we receive under one kind alone, because under either kind we receive both the body and blood of Christ; whereas our adversaries that make this objection receive neither one nor the other, but only a little bread and wine. Besides, this objection does not sound well in *Protestant* mouths, because they say those words of Christ were not spoken of the sacrament, but only of faith.

Are all Christians commanded to drink of the cup? Matt. xxvi. 27, "Drink ye all of it."

No: that command was only addressed to the twelve apostles, who were the *all* that were then present, "and they all drank of it." Mark xiv. 23.

How do you prove that those words are not to be understood as a command directed to all Christians?

Because the Church of Christ, which is the best interpreter of his word, never understood them so; and therefore from the very beginning, on many occasions, she gave the holy communion in one kind, for instance, to children, to the sick, to the faithful in time of persecution, to be carried home with them, &c., as appears from the most certain monuments of antiquity.

But are not the faithful thus deprived of a great part of the grace of this sacrament?

No: because under one kind they receive the same as they would do under both, inasmuch as they receive Christ himself whole and entire, the author and fountain of all graces.

Why then should the Priest, in the Mass, receive in both kinds any more than the rest of the faithful?

Because the mass being a sacrifice, in which, by the institution of our Lord, the shedding of his blood and his death was to be in a lively manner represented; it is requisite that the Priest, who, as the Minister of Christ, offers this sacrifice, should, for the more lively representing of the separation of Christ's blood from his body, consecrate and receive in both kinds as often as he says mass. Whereas, at other times, neither Priest, nor Bishop, nor the Pope himself, even upon their death-bed, receives any otherwise than the rest of the faithful, viz., in one kind only.

Have you any texts of Scripture that favour communion in one kind?

Yes: 1st, All such texts as promise everlasting life to them that receive, though but in *one kind;* as John vi. 51. "The bread that I will give is my flesh, which I will give for the life of the world." Ver. 57. "He that eateth me, even he shall live by me." Ver. 58, "He that eateth of this bread shall live for ever."

2dly, All such texts as make mention of the faithful receiving the holy communion, under the name of *breaking of bread,* without any mention of the cup; as Acts ii. 42. "They continued stedfastly in the apostolic doctrine of fellowship, and in breaking of bread and in

prayers." Ver. 46. "Continuing daily with one accord in the temple, and breaking bread from house to house." Acts xx. 7. "Upon the first day of the week, when the disciples came together to break bread." Luke xxiv. 30, 31. "He took bread and blessed it, and brake it, and gave it to them, and their eyes were opened and they knew him, and he vanished out of their sight." 1 Cor. x. 17. "We being many, are one bread, and one body, for we are all partakers of that one bread."

3dly, 1 Cor. xi. 27. Where the apostle declares, that whosoever receives under either kind unworthily, is guilty both of the body and blood of Christ. "Whosoever shall eat this bread, or drink (ἢ πίνῃ) this cup of the Lord unworthily, shall be guilty of the body and blood of our Lord." Where the *Protestant* translators have evidently corrupted the text by putting in "*and* drink," instead of "*or* drink," as it is in the original.

What are the reasons why the Church does not give the communion to all her children in both kinds?

1st, Because the danger of spilling the blood of Christ, which could hardly be avoided if all were to receive the cup. 2dly, Because, considering how soon wine decays, the sacrament could not well be kept for the sick in both kinds. 3dly, Because some constitutions can neither endure the taste nor smell of wine. 4thly, Because true wine, in some countries, is very hard to be met with. 5thly, In fine, in opposition to those heretics who deny that Christ is received whole and entire under either kind.

The first and second paragraphs of this chapter are expended in vain efforts of quibbling and twisting to prove that the real blood of our Saviour is contained in a baked wafer, and which we admit is quite as easy as, by a Popish *hocus pocus*, to *show* that the wafer itself is substantial flesh*.

* The logic of Popery, according to a favourite phrase of her own, may be defined, the art of *proving* that *that is* which *is not*, and *vice versâ*. Thus, under *one* kind *only*, *two* kinds are received;—the priest changes bread and wine into flesh and blood—flesh contains blood, and, consequently, *is* flesh and blood—flesh and blood compose a human body—a human body must possess a soul; thus it is as clearly demonstrated that a soul, flesh, and blood, are to be made of a little flour and water, as that a horse-chesnut is a chesnut-horse; or that a cat which has *one* tail must have *three*. Either of these, or such propositions, by a parity of Popish *reasoning*, could be as readily "*proved*"—and *would* be, did she require them—as any of her other contradictions, in her own way, thus:—"Because, as we have seen," a cat *has* a tail, and *No*-cat *has two* tails; "now, both faith and reason tell us," that every cat that has a tail must have *one* tail *more* than *No*-cat; from whence it is evident that every cat with *one* tail must have *three* In fine, *Saint Feline* himself, who flourished seven thousand years before the flood, declared his conviction of this plain fact in opposition to the heretics of *his* day; and that which has been proved to be the general belief for so many thousand years, is much *safer* to rely upon than any *new* doctrine which the modern sects have rashly dared to oppose to it.

This denial of the cup to the laity is another of the *subtractions* from the doctrines of our Saviour, ordained by Popery, we suppose, as a *set-off* against the denial of marriage to her clergy. In justice to her, however, it is but fair that, in the outset, we should here admit, independent of the miracle itself of blood and flesh being in baked flour and water, we scarcely know what she means by that which we suppose must be taken as her defence of it. The first quotation of Scripture is in proof that CHRIST *can die no more*, and which we readily admit; yet, as the Pope says that every individual in partaking of his sacrament "receives CHRIST *himself whole and entire*," are Papists thus taught to believe they eat up their wafer *alive* every day!!! This is too contemptible to proceed farther on the subject.

To the next paragraph we agree, viz. that what Papists do is according to the doctrines of the Popish Church; all that we contend for is, that *these are directly opposed to the doctrines of our* LORD and SAVIOUR JESUS CHRIST. Our readers have a fair opportunity of judging for themselves; but we must lament that the spirit of rancour is so frequently manifested towards those who take for their Rule of Faith the acknowledged word of God in preference to the dogmas and legends of Popery*.

* Why should "a poor worm of the earth," who calls himself CHRIST'S *vicegerent*, indulge in such repeated attacks and sneers against those who deny his spiritual authority? Had the Pope set out *openly* as a *controversialist*, it would have been all very fair—so he kept it in mind that the *object* of his championship had been to *refute* rather than to abuse: but surely, in writing a "*Profession of Faith*" for the direction of his followers, it was not in *such* a work that (from one declaring himself or his Church to be an *infallible* ruler over all Christians) we were to expect to learn what are the tenets which proceed from "*Protestant mouths*," where his business was to *prove the truth of his own?* Look at our Protestant prayer-book—wherein does it contain a sneer or a reproof contrary to the language of Christ, towards any men who differ in opinion with those who use it? Wherein does it set forth one single proposition opposed to the Scriptures, from whence the rites of our Church are chiefly taken? This prayer-book is open to attack (as is every other book) if there can be found in it anything to condemn; but *it attacks not any*. It clearly expresses what it teaches; and it teaches our ministers to be humble —not that they have the power to damn, but to pray that they may be illuminated "with the true knowledge" of the word of God, and their flocks to forgive their enemies; whilst both clergy and laity pray that God "will have mercy upon all men" —not as is the case, with the Popish *approved* catechisms which, from infancy, in-

Were further confirmation necessary to prove the vast difference between the Popish Church and the Church of Christ, we find it in the reply to the next question proposed. "TRUE—but"—but *what?* Why, *according to the doctrine of Popery we take in both kinds, although we are aware we receive but in one.*" Is this not the *true* sense of the passage? We can understand it in no other. We are then informed that the twelve apostles were the "*All*" who were commanded to drink of the cup, and who drank accordingly:—so were they when the *bread* was eaten, which might, by the same *reasoning*, be taken away also. We have already noticed this circumstance, (page 88) and therefore will merely add, that Matthew, (chap. xxvi.) Mark, (chap. xiv.) and John, (chap. vi.) assure us Christ told his disciples, the *laity*, that they were to *drink* and *eat both*, in the language quoted by the Pope himself. The next question is solved in the usual manner; viz. because Popery chooses so to solve it; or rather, as it is a negative matter—because she never understood it otherwise. In this, however, she is mistaken, as we will show presently by her own words. It is some-

---

culcate the doctrine of *invidious distinction* between Papists themselves and the rest of God's creatures (*a*).

(*a*) Q. Who are our neighbours?
A. All mankind—especially (Roman) Catholics.
Q. Why especially (Roman) Catholics?
A. Because *they* are members of the mystical body of Christ, "the Church."
These questions and replies are extracted from the Douay Catechism (chap. 7), entitled *Charity* Expounded. The following is a further illustration of the *charitable* tenets inculcated by the Romish Church, and extracted from the same approved source:—
Q. What are the points of faith we are taught by the (Roman) Catholic Church?
A. *Such only as God has revealed to her (!!!)* [The *Twelve New* Articles are here forgotten?]
And then, in the same (2d) chapter:—
Q. What vice is opposite to (the *Romish*) faith?
A. *Heresy*, which is an obstinate error in matters of faith.
Let us see who are those whom Roman Catholic children are taught from earliest infancy "*charitably*" to consider in a state of damnation.
Q. In what manner is Christ present in the Eucharist?
A. By the true and real presence of his divine and human nature, and not in figure only, as *heretics* would have it.
Thus are infants taught that the comparatively few of God's creatures who profess Popery are the only beings in existence who can escape eternal perdition!—So much for Papal *charity*.

what thoughtless of her also, we opine, to speak of the *antiquity* of the denial of the cup—it was ordained to be taken and received by Christ himself—how much *earlier were her* institutions ?* We are then informed that the priest receives in both kinds in the ceremony of the mass, merely to show "a more lively representation"—or, in plain language, for *effect;* no actual *necessity* for his doing so is assigned. We are next referred to all such texts as speak of bread *only*, to prove that Christ did not intend the cup to be received by the laity, although he so clearly commanded it: still these are but *negative* proofs—Popery cannot show a single passage wherein the cup is *forbidden* to be taken. Surely one affirmative witness is worth a dozen negative ones ? When Pope Stephen VIIth dug up the body of his predecessor, Formosus, and threw it in the Tiber, although 5000 men might swear they did *not see* it, would this statement invalidate the testimony of 500 who swore they *did?* The text which we quoted in the last chapter (1 Cor. x. 17.) is adduced here because *bread* is spoken of: are Papists to take it in a *figu-*

* Far be it from us to pass over the *antiquity* of those institutions of Popery which she herself declares had been invented many ages *before Christianity was known to the world:* thus the begging Carmelites gravely insist that the prophet *Elias* was the founder of their order, and inducted by angels: by the same Popish penmen we are assured that Jonah, Micah, and Obadiah, were his first disciples; and that *Pythagoras*, also, was a member of this ancient community. That this matter might not be incomplete, we are told that *nunneries* were formed at the same period by the wife of Obadiah, who, to evade the attacks of impertinence to which she was exposed at the court of king Ahab, "bound herself by a vow of chastity (in the absence of her husband); received the *veil* from the hands of *father* Elias, and thus became the first *abbess* of the Carmelite order of Nuns." The tonsure, or bald head, by which the Carmelites distinguish themselves, is derived, they tell us, from the prophet, who was mocked by the children (2 *Kings, chap.* ii. *ver.* 23.), and who then went to Mount Carmel. Such is the story told of the *origin* of these sturdy beggars, by themselves:—Papebroch and other much more credible Romanist writers, give a somewhat more rational account of them, when they tell us that, about the middle of the twelfth century, Berthold, a Calabrian, with a few companions, set out for Mount Carmel, where they built a small house with an adjoining chapel; this little community soon increased, and was formed into a monastic institution by Albert, Patriarch of Jerusalem. Papebroch, though a learned Jesuit, was accused by the Carmelites, for having disputed the antiquity and *dignity* of their order; and, in 1698, Pope Innocent XII. deemed it prudent to command silence among these *lowly* members of his infallible church, upon the "antiquity" of this order of *dignified* begging friars.

rative or a *literal* sense—*as* bread, or the real flesh of the *apostles?* The quotation of St. Paul "whosoever shall eat this bread *or* drink this cup," &c. is unfortunate;—we are inclined to attribute this essay rather to the Doctor than to the Pope, inasmuch as the assertion is, by the learned, generally attributed to the Jesuit cardinal Bellarmine, who flourished in the latter end of the sixteenth century, after Pius had been dead several years. To whom, however, the credit is due is of little importance, since if all the *ands* in the creed may be "*understood*"* as *ors*, instead of believing in this, *and* this, &c. it will, according to Popish doctrine, be quite sufficient to profess the belief of this, *or* this, *or* this, &c. But we beg to refer our readers to the extracts made by the Pope in the last chapter. In treating of his *transubstantiation*, he required the *and* in the same sense it is used here—*ergo*, it is used throughout the chapter; as "except ye eat the flesh of the Son of Man *and* drink his blood," &c. "Whosoever eateth my flesh *and* drinketh my blood," &c. &c. (see page 111.) This turning *ands* into *ors* is mutilating the scriptures with a vengeance! It is thus that every command of the ALMIGHTY may be evaded, and instead of the declaration of St. James (chap. ii. ver. 10), "he who offends in one point is guilty of all," Popery has only to insist that it is a "mistranslation," that it *should have been rendered, He who obeys in one point keeps the whole law;* and her votaries will swear she is correct *because* she *must be infallible!*

And now, after all these *reasons* assigned for taking away the cup from the laity, it is asked, "*What are* the *reasons*" for doing so? The five which follow are somewhat curious, and to which we beg the particular attention of our readers. The first is to avoid "the *danger of spilling* the BLOOD OF CHRIST."

---

* Such is the word used by the Cardinal (*De Sacram. Eucharist, lib.* iv. *c.* 25.) We suspect the Doctor to have *improved* upon it.

But mark the second!—Because WINE *soon decays!*—We said as much in the last chapter; but if the elements be "*truly, really,* and *substantially,* the BODY and BLOOD, *together with the* SOUL *and* DIVINITY *of our* LORD JESUS CHRIST," (chap. iv. p. 110,) *how,* we ask, are they any longer BREAD and WINE, and what CHRISTIAN can believe the body, soul, and divinity of GOD is *corruptible?* Again, we are told, thirdly, that "some constitutions can neither bear the *taste* nor the *smell* of WINE;" and fourthly,—as though to prove the very essence of contradiction in the absurd and impious doctrines of the Romish Church—it is said, "because TRUE WINE in some countries is very hard to be met with!" Was the wine that Christ and his apostles drank white or red—Rhenish or Falernian? Oh! Popery, Popery—abject in thy presumption, how wretchedly contemptible appear the most gifted of thy followers, who, denied the privilege of exercising their own reason, meanly descend to sacrifice their learning to their prejudices; who prostrate themselves with fanatical adoration before the deity their own hands have created, and which the "Book of Life" would teach them to spurn! But we must not forget the fifth *reason,* since this we think more *curious* than its precursors. By this we learn, that the cause of the denial of the cup is—*not* because Popery herself affects to suppose it to be the doctrine of Christ; *not,* indeed, that she ever thought it *right* to withhold it—no,—she has "*in fine*" so acted, to show her power over MIND, because REASON denied it!

We remember, in the course of our observations upon the last chapter, to have promised a poetical quotation in imitation of the Doctor adducing a couplet from our immortal Dryden; but nothing applicable has fallen under our notice, neither do we wish to break our promise; and having fairly and literally given Popery's *proofs* in her own words, we e'en try our hand at a rhyme upon what she *could* do by the *infallibility* of her *arguments*:—

Thus Popery could prove (as Swift has said*)
Good wine and mutton are in stale brown bread;
A nostrum—once in Romish gullets cramm'd,
Which they must swallow (WHOLE) or else be damn'd.

The Pope, although for another purpose, has himself quoted (p. 110) so many positive commands of our Saviour that ALL should drink of the cup, that it would be unnecessary here to repeat them.

For the space of *fourteen hundred years* the *laity had always received* in BOTH KINDS.† From 1403 to 1417, Boniface IX., Innocent VII., Gregory XII., Alexander V. and John XXIII. were Popes; and *three* of them, each at the head of his faction at *one time;* nor could these Pontiffs, as Mosheim says, be *persuaded* by *any means* to "*prefer* the *peace* of the *Church* to the *gratification of their own ambition.*" The Emperor of France, Sigismund, prevailed upon John to summon a council, which met at Constance in the year 1414; and during the sitting of this council it was *made* heresy to administer the Sacrament in both kinds to the laity. Either the Pope's statement or our's must be incorrect: let Papists ask their priests where the error lies.

CHAP. VI.—OF THE MASS.

What is the Catholic doctrine as to the Mass?

That in the Mass there is offered to God a true, proper, and propitiatory sacrifice for the living and the dead.

What do you mean by the Mass?

The consecration and oblation of the body and blood of Christ under the sacramental veils or appearances of bread and wine: so that the Mass was instituted by Christ himself at his last supper: Christ himself said the first Mass; and ordained that his Apostles and their successors should do the like. "Do this in remembrance of me." Luke xxii. 19.

What do you mean by a propitiatory sacrifice?

A sacrifice for obtaining *mercy*, or by which God is moved to *mercy*.

How do you prove that the Mass is such a sacrifice?

---

* *See A Tale of a Tub.*

† Pope Gelasius declared it to be *sacrilege* in any persons to mutilate this sacrament, commanding that if they refused the cup they should be denied the bread also. *(Apud Gratian. can. comperimus, de Consec. Dis. 2.)*

Because in the Mass Christ himself, as we have seen, chap. iv., is really present, and by virtue of the consecration is there exhibited and presented to the eternal Father under the sacramental veils, which by their separate consecration represent his death. Now, what can more move God to mercy, than the oblation of his only Son there really present, and under this figure of death representing to his Father that death which he suffered for us?

What scripture do you bring for this?

The words of consecration as they are related by St. Luke, chap. xxii. 19, 20. "This is my body which is given for you—This cup is the New Testament in my blood which (cup) is shed for you." For if the cup was shed for us, that is, for our sins, it must needs be *propitiatory*, at least, by applying to us the fruits of the *bloody sacrifice* of the cross.

What other texts of the Scripture do the Fathers apply to the sacrifice of the Mass?

1. The words of God in the *first* chapter of the prophet *Malachi*, vi. 10, 11, where rejecting the Jewish sacrifice, he declares his acceptance of that sacrifice or *pure offering* which should be made to him in every place among the *Gentiles*. 2dly, Those words of the Psalmist, Ps. cx. 4: "Thou art a priest for ever according to the order of Melchisedech:" why according to the order of Melchisedech, say the holy Fathers, but by reason of the sacrifice of the Eucharist prefigured by that bread and wine offered by Melchisedech. Gen. xiv. 18.

Why does the church celebrate the Mass in the Latin, which the people for the most part do not understand?

1st, Because it is the ancient language of the church used in the public liturgy in all ages in the western parts of the world. 2dly, For a greater uniformity in the public worship; that so a Christian, in whatsoever country he chances to be, may still find the liturgy performed in the same manner, and in the same language, to which he is accustomed at home. 3dly, To avoid the changes which all vulgar languages are daily exposed to. 4thly, Because the Mass being a sacrifice which the priest, as minister of Christ, is to offer, and the prayers of the Mass being mostly fitted for this end, it is enough that they be in a language which he understands. Nor is this any ways injurious to the people, who are instructed to accompany him in every part of this sacrifice by prayers accommodated to their devotion, which they have in their ordinary prayer books.

What is the best manner of hearing Mass?

The Mass being instituted for a standing memorial of Christ's death and passion, and being in substance the same sacrifice as that which Christ offered upon the cross, because both the priest and victim is the same Jesus Christ; there can be no better manner of hearing Mass than by meditating on the death and passion of Christ here represented; and putting one's self in the same dispositions of

faith, love, repentance, &c. as we should have endeavoured to excite in ourselves had we been present at his passion and death on Mount Calvary.

What are the ends for which this sacrifice is offered to God?

Principally these four, which both priest and people ought to have in view. 1. For God's own honour and glory. 2. In thanksgiving for all his blessings conferred on us through Jesus Christ our Lord. 3. In satisfaction for our sins through his blood. 4. For obtaining grace and all necessary blessings from God.

A *propitiatory* sacrifice is a sacrifice by which an *atonement* is made for sin committed; and certainly attending the ceremony of the Mass is the most *easy* way ever invented by the artifice of man for the accomplishment of such an object. By *Mass* (from the Latin *Massa*) we understand the body of a book or form of worship;* but that "Christ said the first mass" would be too contemptible an assertion to notice, did not so many who think they have nothing to do towards the preservation of their souls but rely upon the infallible power of their priests, believe it. If the words "Do this in remembrance of me," constituted the first Mass, why has this very simple form, accompanied by the breaking of bread and receiving the wine, been departed from?† Neither will Popery dare to assert *now*, much as she *has* dared, that our Saviour addressed his disciples in a language which they did not understand, as does the Romish priest, accompanied with the ringing of little bells and all her paraphernalia of tawdry

* There are many various accounts of the derivation of the word *Mass*. Baronius says it is derived from the Hebrew *Missach* (an oblation or sacrifice). It is also said to proceed from the Latin *Missa, Missorum*, because in former times the Catechumens (distinguished by this appellation in the first ages of Christianity from the Believers) who were in a state of probation, were sent out of the church when the deacons said, *Ite Missa est*, after reading the sermon, the Epistle, and Gospel; not being allowed to assist at the consecration. There are others who derive this word from *Missio* (sending), because the prayers of those on earth are *sent* (ascend) up to heaven.

† It is not unworthy of remark that in this paragraph it is broadly insinuated to those forbidden to examine further, that these words were used by our Saviour *after* he had "*said Mass*." "Christ himself," says the Pope, "*said the first Mass*, AND ordained that his Apostles and their successors should do the like—'Do this *in remembrance* of me.'" Do *what?*—Say other Masses, it is *implied*, although ALL HE did was to break and partake of the bread and drink of the wine; and his positive commands were that the bread and wine should be taken *in his remembrance*. We find nothing like a Mass spoken of throughout the whole Scriptures, although we

ornament. We have already said, the *sacrifice* which God requires is *a truly penitent heart*, and not the vain ceremonies instituted to impose on the senses. Reason and St. Paul tell us that a *decent* ceremony only, performed "*in a seemly and due order*," is requisite; not that we are to rely upon *forms of worship* as efficacious means for the preservation of our souls.

Christ was the high priest when he "brake the bread," an offering which his disciples received and ate; but this is not enough for Popery, who insists upon eating the priest *also!* Assuming, for a moment, that the body of Christ was really present, would it, we ask, be more likely to "move God to mercy" than to anger by the *daily* oblation, or sacrifice, of "his only Son?" Protestants aver that they are receivers of the *spiritual* fruits of the sacrifice upon the cross. "The *cup* shed" is merely figurative, as every schoolboy would discover, if permitted to look into the Scriptures; as are the words "which *is* shed for you," it not *then* having been shed, as before observed. In the *first* chapter of Malachi, the prophet "*complaineth of Israel's unkindness; of their irreligion and profaneness.*" Whoever of "the Holy Fathers" may have applied this chapter to "*the Mass*," there is no *allusion* to such a ceremony contained therein, nor in *any other chapter throughout the Bible.* What proofs the Pope might have drawn from ch. vi. 10, 11, if there had been such verses of such a chapter, it is impossible to say. All that we *have* to say upon this part of our subject, is, that we have what is known as King James's Bible before us, containing the references to the *ori-*

---

prefer the daring impudence of Popery as exhibited in the French editions of them to the paltry insinuation before us. The New Testament (*Louvaine Edit. Rue St. Jaques, Paris*, 1701), which, it may be observed, is an *approved* translation, thus renders *Ministrantibus illis Domino* (as they ministered to the Lord, Acts xiii. v. 2.) *Or comme ils offroient au Seigneur le sacrifice de la Messe;* that is, *Now, as they offered to the Lord the sacrifice of the Mass.* Such are the *correct* translations of the Scriptures *approved* by Popery. The canon of the Mass was instituted by Gregory I., Bishop of Rome, in the latter end of the sixth century, but was not adopted by the other Latin churches for several ages afterwards. See *Mosh. Eng. Trans.* i. 422; *Ref. to Theod.; De Canone Missa Gregoriano.*

ginal texts in the margin; and in which Bible *the Book of Malachi contains but four chapters, and the fourth chapter but six verses.* Papists, to be sure, are not permitted to read the Scriptures; they rely upon their priests for their salvation; and thus, as the light of the Gospel is hidden from them, and their priests are *infallible,* the laity are as well satisfied with such texts and chapters as come from the papal manufactory, as they (at present) are with such selections as they receive of Holy Writ.* We may observe that it is said above, the *Fathers* apply the *undiscovered* † chapter to the Mass; and whom we are told also apply the text quoted from the Psalms to the Real Presence. But when the King of Salem "brought forth bread and wine" to Abraham, it is *not* said that Abraham *ate* the "real and substantial body" of Melchisedech? On the contrary, Melchisedech afterwards blessed him. And now, we ask what has this at all to do with the ceremony of the Mass? Let us keep more closely to the question.‡

By the Old Testament we learn that Christ was to die ONCE—*a perfect* and *complete sacrifice* for the sins of all who would seek his mercy—*not* by the performance of works wrought, but through faith and repentance. "He was wounded for our transgressions; he was bruised for our iniquities; the chastisement of our peace was upon him, and with his stripes we are HEALED." (Isaiah, lii. 5.) We refer our readers to the above chapter, trusting that they will read the *whole* of it. They will find it as clearly opposed to what Popery calls her daily "sacrifice of the mass," as is

---

* "The present advocates of the Church of Rome are justly to be suspected of unworthy artifices in managing the present controversies. Bishop Milner refers to a document in the Lambeth Library, which exists only in his own imagination. *See Mr. Todd's Introduction to his Defence of Cranmer's Doctrine of the Sacrament, p. 7. See also Mr. T.'s Remarks upon the Observations of Dr. Lingard." Referred to by Mr. Townsend.*

† Be it remembered that this reference is given in the *twelfth* edition. *See p.* 13.

‡ We will wholly dispose of the sacrificial part of the ceremony previous to commenting on its performance in an unknown tongue, as these are distinct questions.

the latter to the human understanding, and to the following declarations contained in the *New* Testament.

Acts, xx. 28. "Take heed therefore unto yourselves, and to all the flock over the which the Holy Ghost hath made you *overseers* to feed the Church of God, which he hath PURCHASED WITH HIS OWN BLOOD."

Rom. iii. 23 to 29. "For all have sinned and come short of the glory of God; being justified FREELY BY HIS GRACE through the *redemption* that is in Christ Jesus, whom God hath set forth to be a propitiation, *through faith in his blood*, to declare his righteousness for the remission of sins that are past, through the forbearance of God:—to declare, *I say*, at this time his righteousness, that he might be just, and the justifier of him which believeth in Jesus. *Where is boasting then?* It is excluded. By what law,—of *works? Nay;*—but *by the law of faith;* therefore, we conclude that a man is justified by faith, without the deeds of the law."—And here, we ask, if a man cannot be saved by the law of Moses, what must become of him who trusts in the laws and *means of grace* (!) invented by Popery?

Rev. i. 5. "Unto Him that loved us, and WASHED US FROM OUR SINS in His own blood," &c.

Hebrews, vii. 26, 27, 28. "For such an high priest *became* us, who is *holy, harmless, undefiled, separate* from sinners, and made higher than the Heavens:—who needeth not daily, as those high priests, to offer up sacrifice, first for his own sins, and then for the people's; for this HE did ONCE when he *offered up himself.* For the law maketh men high priests which have infirmity; but the word of the oath which was since the law, maketh the Son who is consecrated for evermore."—Again, mark the covenant of God, quoted (Heb. viii. 10.) by St. Paul.—"I will put my laws into their *minds*, and write them in their *hearts*," &c. It would far exceed our limits were we to quote ALL the plain and innumerable proofs adduced in the Scriptures of the sacrifice

of Christ, ONCE offered, being *a full complete* and *perfect oblation for the remission of sins*, opposed as it is by Popery in *her* sacrifice of the mass. The following passages are extracted promiscuously from the 9th and 10th chapters of St. Paul's Epistle to the Hebrews; and to these chapters we beg to refer our readers, on the present subject. We commence at the 9th verse of the 9th chapter; but whether Paul, in speaking of a figure of the old law *prefigured the law of Popery*, our readers must judge for themselves.

Speaking of the Jewish tabernacle, he says, it "was a figure for the time then present, in which were offered both gifts and sacrifices that could not make him that did the service perfect, *as pertaining to the conscience*, which stood only in *meats* and *drinks* and *divers washings*, and *carnal ordinances* (*i. e. other* carnal ordinances) *imposed on them* until the time of *Reformation*." "For where a Testament is, there must also of necessity be the *death of the Testator;* for a Testament is of force *after men are dead;* otherwise, it is of *no strength at all whilst the Testator liveth*." "For Christ is not entered into the holy places made with hands, which are the *figures* of the true; but into Heaven itself, now to appear in the presence of God for us:—nor yet that he should *offer himself often*, as the high priest entereth the holy place with the blood of others; for *then must he often have suffered* since the foundation of the world; but now ONCE in the end of the world, (*i. e.*, the last age of the world, the *Gospel age*,) hath he appeared, *to put away sin by the sacrifice of* HIMSELF; and, *as it is appointed unto mankind once to die*, but after this the judgment, *so* CHRIST WAS ONCE OFFERED *to bear the sins of many;* and unto them that look for him shall he appear *the* SECOND *time* without sin unto salvation." Such are a portion of the contents of the 9th chapter; those that follow are from the 10th. "But in those sacrifices there is a *remembrance* again made of sins every year." "We are sanctified through the offering of the *body*

of Jesus Christ ONCE FOR ALL; and (*i. e. and still*) every priest standeth daily ministering and offering oftentimes the same sacrifices, *which can never take away sins;* but this man, after he had offered ONE sacrifice for sins, for ever sat down on the right hand of God;" "for, by ONE offering, *he hath perfected for ever* them that are sanctified." The Apostle then repeats this declaration of God:—"Their sins and iniquities will I remember no more;" and adds, "Now, where remission of these is, THERE IS NO MORE OFFERING FOR SIN;" and which, that it may be the more deeply impressed upon our hearts, he thus (at the 26th verse) repeats: "For if we sin *wilfully*, after that we have received the *knowledge of the truth*, THERE REMAINETH NO MORE SACRIFICE FOR SINS!" Our Roman Catholic readers must take their choice, whether they will still prefer the doctrines of Popery to those of our Saviour,—Holy Writ to fabulous legends?

We will now trace the sacrament of the Lord's Supper from the pure age of the Apostles, until the corruptions of Popery obscured its original simplicity, and persuaded her followers to believe, and to assert that, by her own power, she had changed its spiritual efficacy, as ordained by Christ, into an irrestible *charm*.

The earliest Christians assembled in each other's houses, as the Apostle tells us, (see p. 47,) which were called churches*, although they met to join in public worship in places appropriated solely to that purpose soon after the resurrection†. In these assemblies the Scriptures were read publicly, to which an exhortation succeeded; prayers followed, and which were repeated by the people after the presiding bishop or presbyter ‡: to these, hymns were added;

---

* The Evangelists speak of the "House" where the Lord held his Last Supper, Matt. xxvi. v. 18.; Mark xiv. v. 3.; Luke xxii. v. 10.

† See references (note *a*.) Mosheim, Eng. Trans., vol. i. p. 93.

‡ Ibid.

but the precise *form* of the Christian worship was not the same in all places *. Bread and wine were, however, taken and received, in *remembrance* of Christ, after it had been consecrated by the bishop, who said prayers, to which the people assented by pronouncing "*Amen* †!" — How *exact* in the *principle*—how *like* in the *very form* of worship to the English Church at the present day!

We have already noticed (p. 123) the commencement of the doctrine of the Real Presence in the eighth century, and its fanatical defence by Paschasius Radbert: Mosheim says ‡, "The religion of this century consisted almost entirely in a motley round of external rites and ceremonies; we are not, therefore, to wonder that more zeal and diligence were employed in multiplying and regulating these outward marks of superstitious devotion, than in correcting the vices and follies of men, in enlightening their understandings, and forming their hearts. The administration of the sacrament of the Lord's Supper, which was deemed the most solemn and important branch of divine worship, was now everywhere deformed by a variety of senseless fopperies, which destroyed the beautiful simplicity of that affecting and salutary institution. We also find manifest traces in this century of that superstitious custom of celebrating what were called *solitary masses* §, though it is difficult to decide whether they were instituted by a public law, or introduced by the authority of private persons. Be that as it may, this single custom is sufficient to give us an idea of the superstition and darkness that sat brooding over the Christian church in this ignorant

* See Justin Martyr's Second Apol., p. 98.

† Ibid. ‡ Eng. Trans. v. i. p. 518.

§ The learned Doctor Maclaine, in a note on the above, adds, "Solitary or private masses were those that were celebrated by the priest alone, in behalf of souls detained in purgatory, as well as upon some other particular occasions. These masses were prohibited by the laws of the Church, but they were a rich source of profit to the clergy. They were condemned by the Canons of a Synod assembled at Mentz, under Charlemagne, as criminal innovations, and as the fruits of avarice and sloth." However, such fruits as they were, Popery was too well aware of their advantages to refuse such little pickings to her principal agents, and solitary masses have ever since been fair game to her clergy.

age; and renders it unnecessary to enter into a further detail of the absurd rites with which a designing priesthood continued to disfigure the religion of Jesus."

We will now inquire into the peculiar advantages of the members of the Romish Church hearing its service in a language they do not understand. And, 1st, it is said it is "because it is the ancient language," &c.—that is, because, when the liturgy was first used by the Latins *they understood* it. 2dly. "For a greater uniformity," &c. So that Christians who do not understand the Latin service they are taught to *listen* to, *at home*, may *uniformly remain in ignorance* of it any and everywhere else. "To avoid the changes which all vulgar languages are exposed to." This, we should have thought, would have been better avoided by the *people knowing* when any change was *made*, as has so often been the case with the different *kinds* of infallibility *inherent* in different Popes*. 4thly. It is said that it is enough that the prayers be in a language which is understood by the priest "*only*"—the people (*as far as they know*) accompanying him in some other language which *they* themselves understand †. We then arrive at another popish "mystery," namely, that to eat up both priest and victim is the best pos-

* Hippolito Aldobrandini ascended the papal chair under the title of Clement VIII. Dr. Maclaine says, "This pontiff had an edition of the Vulgate [*which is St. Jerome's translation of the New Testament from the Greek*] published, which was *very different* from that of Pope Sixtus [the Vth]; and that is one of the *many* instances of the *contrariety of opinions* that has prevailed amongst the infallible heads of the Church of Rome." Mr. Butler's account of this circumstance is, that the edition of Sixtus "*was the authentic edition* of the 'Church,' and, *consequently*, inerrant where the dogma of faith or morals 'were' concerned, but *not* inerrant *in any other sense*." "This edition," continues Mr. Charles Butler, "was found to be *so erroneous* that the copies were called in, and a new edition was published by Clement VIII., the *immediate successor* of Sixtus," &c. Is Mr. B. diffident in acknowledging the occasional *rapid succession* of Popes, or are all our most approved chronologies "erroneous"? We have referred to some of these, by which we learn that after Sixtus V. came Urban VII., Gregory XIV., Innocent IX., *to whom succeeded* Clement VIII. These changes all occurred in the space of *two or three* years; but it is not our present business to state the particulars of them, although it may be relied upon they were *all equally* "infallible."

† The Jesuit, Suarez, says, (*De Orat.* lib. iii. c. 14.) "*That it is not necessary to prayer, the person praying should think of what he speaks!*" This Suarez wrote in defence of the murder of kings, for which he became a favourite of the tyrant Pope Paul V.

sible way to incite people to faith, love, and repentance—to make satisfaction for sin, and to obtain all necessary blessings! Let us see if we cannot produce from the scriptures more clearly-defined evidences as to the necessity of the service of the CHURCH of CHRIST being performed in the vulgar tongues of all nations:—with the church of Popery we should not have interfered, did she not insist that she was Christian whilst opposing her own tenets, with all her power, to the doctrines of Christ. We quote from the 1st Cor. ch. xiv., which treats of the gift of prophecy, and of religious worship, in a known language; "He that speaketh in an *unknown* tongue speaketh not unto men but unto God, for no man understandeth him. He that speaketh in an unknown tongue edifieth *himself*. For if the trumpet give an uncertain sound, who shall prepare himself to the battle? So likewise *ye*, except ye utter by the tongue *words easy to be understood, how shall it be known what is spoken?* If I know not the meaning of the voice, I shall be unto him that speaketh *a barbarian;* and he that speaketh shall be a barbarian unto me. If I pray in an unknown tongue my spirit prayeth, but my understanding is unfruitful. What is it then? I will pray with the spirit, and I will pray with the *understanding also;* I will sing with the spirit, and I will sing *with the understanding also:* else, when thou shalt bless with the spirit, *how shall he that occupieth the room of the unlearned* say AMEN! at thy giving of thanks, seeing he *understandeth not what thou sayest? In the* CHURCH *I had rather speak five words with my understanding*, that by my voice I might teach others also, than *ten thousand words in an* UNKNOWN TONGUE. Brethren, be not *children in understanding;* howbeit, in *malice* be ye children, but in *understanding* be ye men. If, therefore, the whole Church be come together into one place, and all speak with tongues, [*i. e. with foreign tongues,*] and there come in those that are unlearned, or unbelievers, will they not say that ye are *mad?* Let all things

be done to edifying; for God is not the author of confusion but of peace, as in all Churches of the Saints."

Are not these passages of Scripture as clear and explicit as the "mysteries" of Popery?—we ask the question of Roman Catholics only. Would we could persuade them to *consult* the Scriptures with their "understanding," as the Apostle teaches!

Owing to the corruption of language it was that rendered it doubly necessary to have given the forms of worship of all Christian churches in the vulgar tongue, reasonable as it is to imagine that no honest profession of religious faith would have deemed it contrary to its interests to do so. When the Italian, French, Spanish, and other languages, were mingled with the Latin, and the Latin itself thus became corrupted, instead of adapting the forms of worship to the understanding of the people, it was the policy of the Vatican to keep the Romish laity in as gross ignorance as possible; and of which nothing can be so great a proof as the denial of the very scriptures which Popery herself obliges them to profess to believe in (*without* seeing them) as "the infallible word of God." "The Latin form of worship," says Mosheim, (v. ii. p. 573,) "which had for many ages before been *strongly recommended* by the Popes, was at length enforced in all the western churches by Gregory VII." (in the eleventh century.) "So early as the fourth century," the author above quoted assures us, (v. ii. p. 292, Eng. Trans.) "it would seem as if all possible means had been industriously used to give an air of folly and extravagance to the Christian assemblies*."

* "The hanging up and adoring of the Host was but lately set up," says Cranmer, "by Pope Innocent and Honorius." *Burnett's Hist. &c. vol.* ii. *p.* 116. Many circumstances connected with the worship of the Host were the suggestions of the very dregs of society. Jortin says, (*Rem. vol.* v. *p.* 472,) "This was the case with both the procession and the festival of the Holy Sacrament."

Chap. VII.—Of Purgatory.

What is the doctrine of the Church as to this point?

We constantly hold that there is a Purgatory; and that the souls therein detained are helped by the suffrages of the faithful: that is, by the prayers and alms offered for them, and principally by the holy sacrifice of the mass*.

What do you mean by Purgatory?

A middle state of souls which depart this life in God's grace, yet not without some lesser stains or guilt of punishment, which retards them from entering heaven. But as to the particular place where these souls suffer, or the quality of the torments which they suffer, the Church has decided nothing.

What sort of Christians then go to Purgatory?

1st. Such as die guilty of lesser sins, which we commonly call *venial;* as many christians do, who, either by sudden death or otherwise, are taken out of this life before they have repented for these ordinary failings. 2dly. Such as having been formerly guilty of greater sins, have not made full satisfaction for them to the divine justice.

Why do you say that those who die guilty of lesser sins go to Purgatory?

Because such as depart this life before they have repented of these venial frailties and imperfections, cannot be supposed to be condemned to the eternal torments of hell, since the sins of which they are guilty are but small, which even God's best servants are more or less liable to. Nor can they go straight to heaven in this state, because the scriptures assures us, Rev. xxi. 27, "There shall in no wise enter thither anything that defileth." Now, every sin, be it ever

---

* As the enormities which Popery is pleased to denominate "*venial errors,*" and which she professes to remit, after death, is a doctrine which Protestants condemn as contrary to the express word of God, it is rather surprising (as in *her* profession of faith she so often urges what proceeds from "*Protestant mouths,*" *See p.* 125.) that neither the Pope nor the Doctor should have mis-stated that Protestants "seem to agree with them" in praying for the dead, since Protestants *do* pray for the dead, although they deny the existence of the Pope's Purgatory. In their burial service they pray, that they, "*with all those that are departed in the true Faith of* God's *holy name, may have their perfect consummation,*" &c. Also, in their Communion office, they bless Him "*for all his servants departed this life in his faith and fear;*" and pray that "*with them*" they "*may be partakers of his heavenly kingdom.*" We thus pray for ourselves, and for that which we know must happen, namely, that those who have died "in the true faith and fear of God" may have "*their perfect consummation of bliss.*" Christ himself has taught us thus to pray:—when we pray, "*thy kingdom come, thy will be done,*" we know that these things *must* be accomplished; but by this language of our Saviour, we are taught to express our anxious wish for their completion. Protestants, however, know that their Church has no power either to give or to sell them indulgences, pardons, or remissions, here or hereafter; and that their salvation, through Christ, must depend upon *their own* faith, repentance, and works: they dare not, therefore, rely upon the merits of others, nor trust to a superstitious ceremony of a solitary mass—which money can always purchase—to release them hereafter from whatsoever torments their crimes may subject them to.

so small, certainly defileth the soul. Hence our Saviour assures us, that we are to render an account "even for every idle word," Matt. xii. 36.

Upon what then do you ground your belief of Purgatory?

Upon scripture, tradition, and reason.

How upon Scripture?

Because the scripture in many places assures us, that "God will render to every one according to his works," Ps. lxii. 12., Matt. xvi. 27., Rom. ii. 6., Revel. xxii. 12. Now, this would not be true, if there were no such thing as purgatory; for how would God render to every one according to his works, if such as die in the guilt of any, even the least sin, which they have not taken care to blot out by repentance, would nevertheless go straight to heaven?

Have you any texts which the Fathers and ecclesiastical writers interpret of Purgatory?

Yes, 1 Cor. iii. 13, 14, 15. "Every man's work shall be made manifest. For the day shall declare it, because it shall be revealed by fire. And the fire shall try every man's work of what sort it is. If any man's work abide which he hath built thereupon," (that is, upon the foundation, which is Jesus Christ, ver. 11.) "he shall receive a reward. If any man's works shall be burnt, he shall suffer loss: BUT HE HIMSELF SHALL BE SAVED, YET SO AS BY FIRE." From which text it appears, that such as both in their faith, and in the practice of their lives, have stuck to the foundation, which is Jesus Christ, so as not to forfeit his grace by mortal sin; though they have otherwise been guilty of great imperfections, by building *wood, hay*, and *stubble* (ver. 12), upon this foundation; it appears, I say, that such as these, according to the apostle, must pass through a fiery trial, at the time that "every man's work shall be made manifest:" which is not till the next life; and that they shall be "saved" indeed, "yet so as by fire," that is, by passing first through Purgatory.

2dly. Matt. v. 25. "Agree with thine adversary quickly, whilst thou art in the way with him: lest at any time the adversary deliver thee to the judge, and the judge deliver thee to the officer, and thou be cast into prison. Verily, I say unto thee, thou shalt by no means come out thence till thou hast paid the uttermost farthing." Which text St. Cyprian, one of the most ancient Fathers, understands of the prison of Purgatory. Epistle 52, *ad Antonianum.*

3dly. Matt. xii. 32. "Whosoever speaketh against the Holy Ghost, it shall not be forgiven him, neither in this world, neither in the world to come." Which last words plainly imply, that some sins, which are not forgiven in this world, may be forgiven in the world to come; otherwise, why should our Saviour make any mention of forgiveness in the world to come? Now, if there may be forgiveness of sins in the world to come, there must be a purgatory; for in hell there is no forgiveness, and in heaven no sin.

Besides, a middle place is also implied, 1 Pet. iii. 18, 19, 20, where Christ is said by his spirit to have gone and "preached to the spirits in prison which some time were disobedient." Which prison could be no other than Purgatory; for, as to the spirits that were in the prison of hell, Christ did certainly not go to preach to them.

How do you ground the belief of Purgatory upon tradition?

Because both the Jewish Church, long before our Saviour's coming, and the Christian Church from the very beginning in all ages and all nations, have offered prayers and sacrifice for the repose and relief of the faithful departed: as appears in regard to the Jews from 2 Machab. xii, where this practice is approved of, which books of Machabees, the church, says St. Augustine, l. 18. de Civ. Dei, c. 36, accounts canonical, though the Jews do not. And in regard to the Christian Church, the same is evident from all the Fathers, and the most ancient liturgies. Now, such prayers as these evidently imply the belief of a purgatory: for souls in heaven stand in no need of our prayers, and those in hell cannot be bettered by them.

How do you ground the belief of Purgatory upon reason?

Because reason clearly teaches these two things: 1st. That all and every sin, how small soever, deserves punishment, 2dly, That some sins are so small, either through the levity of the matter, or for want of full deliberation in the action, as not to deserve eternal punishment. From whence it is plain, that besides the place of eternal punishment, which we call hell, there must be also a place of temporal punishment for such as die in lesser sins, and this we call purgatory.

The late Father O'Leary, who is spoken of by many of the Popish Church as a great wit, when opposed as to the belief of a Purgatory, once told an antagonist that he "might *go farther and fare worse*," although those for whose especial accommodation it was invented were of a far different opinion, as we shall show presently. By the present chapter, Roman Catholics are taught that their friends in Purgatory are "helped" by "prayers and alms;" or rather by alms and prayers, since, in a Romish country, at least, the prayers would be of little service until the work of *alms* had been *first* duly performed by the "faithful." We are then told that,—although Popery found the invention of Purgatory to be a most valuable source of her revenue,—she has not yet "*decided*" as to the "*particular place*," "or the *quality* of the torments" *where* the souls suffer. We will only say, in charity,

we trust Popery herself may never be more *assured* of its precise situation. But this Purgatory, it seems, is for those of the Popish Church, who are merely guilty of *venial* sins;—such, for instance, as the sins of fornication, adultery, &c.—not for those who are guilty of the "*mortal* or *deadly* sin" of denying the infallibility of a priest;—*this* is a sin, the Pope's Church tells us, which "deprives the soul of her spiritual life *." Where the Pope relies upon his own logic—that is to say, where he cannot even find any portion of Scripture that he can pervert to his purpose, we are always content to leave him to the full benefit of it. Christians must take the sacred writings as the basis of their arguments; and, in our present undertaking our reliance is upon the SCRIPTURAL EVIDENCE we produce. Passing by, therefore, the Pope's *reasoning* upon his own false premises until he, or his Church, adduce something deserving of notice, we arrive at the references to the Bible. Here, as usual, the very verses he selects from, overturn his own conclusions when they are *fairly* quoted; thus, Rev. xxi. 27, as above—"And there shall in no wise enter into it [the New Jerusalem] anything that defileth, neither whatsoever *worketh* abomination or *maketh* a lie; *but they* [i. e. they only] *which are written in the lamb's book of life*." Can *this verse* be screwed into any *allusion* to Purgatory? Is it because we are told, that we are to render an account of our idle words, and that God will render to every man according to his works—is this Christian doctrine to be impiously pronounced to be a *lie* if the Pope's Purgatory be denied †? Who, calling

* Q. Is any GREAT HONOUR *due* to Priests and ghostly fathers?
A. *Yes; for they are* GOD'S ANOINTED—*represent the* PERSON of CHRIST, *and are the fathers and feeders of our souls!*—See *Douay Cat.*, p. 70 and 41. *Keating and Brown*, 1824.—Who can marvel when such are the principles instilled into the infant mind, that as the youth grow up they should worship their priests with a pagan idolatry?

† We must again here express our hope that the impiety we are obliged to repeat may not be laid to our charge—but the Popish clergy invariably declare, (see p. 31.) "*if they themselves are in an error, the* ALMIGHTY *is accountable for it!!!*"—The writer of this note has himself heard the blasphemy so pronounced by the lips of a Roman Catholic priest!

themselves Christians (Papists alone excepted) are not satisfied that the oblation of Christ himself, and their own faith and repentance is a *sure* means of obtaining the mercy of God?—As the next quotation (from Corinthians) speaks of *fire*, it is, of course, quite enough for Popery to prove it, by her *usual* means, to be her own Purgatory. The above commences at the 13th verse, and contains an allusion to the 11th. This *allusion* was, we presume, *as near* as Popery dared approach towards the *tenth* verse, lest she should jostle against her *supremacy ?*—It runs thus, (1 Cor. iii. 10,) "According to the grace of God, which is given unto me," says St. Paul, "as a wise master-builder, *I have laid the foundation, and another buildeth thereon.* But let every man, [*Popes and their Churches should well consider this*] take heed *how* he buildeth thereupon."

Ver. 11. "For other foundation can no man lay [*i. e. but at his peril*] than that is laid, which is Jesus Christ."

Ver. 12. "Now, if any man build upon this foundation, *gold, silver, precious stones, wood, hay, stubble,*" &c. It was requisite thus to give the quotation fairly (as the Pope nor Doctor thought it necessary to do so), to show more clearly how the word "*fire*" has been strained into Purgatory. The chapter treats of "Paul's commendation of his ministry; and Christ the Foundation,"—themes which are certainly of a very dissimilar kind to Purgatory. Those who build "gold" or "stubble," (which the Pope has barely alluded to,) are the preachers of sound and unsound doctrines; but, "every man's work," says the Apostle, "shall be made manifest. For the day shall declare it, because it shall be revealed by fire, and the fire shall try every man's work of what sort it is." And *did not* the cruel persecutions of the early Christians *try* their faith and works? *Do not* the *fires* of the Inquisition—*does not* the inhuman *Auto de Fe* (where Popery has, or ever *has had,* the power of enkindling the flame,) clearly prove the Apostle's prediction? "If any man's work

shall be burned he shall suffer loss, but he himself shall be saved; yet *so as by fire.*" Is it not a loss, and a severe one, to the martyr of the pure religion of Christ, to witness the destruction of his labours by fanaticism and cruelty; and though the vindictive malice of fiends in human shape destroy "the earthy tabernacle of his soul," yet his immortal spirit is beyond their reach, as Paul says, in the very next verse (16,) "Know ye not that ye are the temple of God, and that the spirit of God dwelleth in you?" But the Pope says, the holy Fathers interpret the text above "of Purgatory:"—it would have been much more to the purpose if he could have found *one single sentence* wherein Christ, the Prophets, or the Apostles, taught the belief of such a doctrine throughout the whole Bible; and which we deny it possible for him to have done. As to the opinion of the "holy Fathers," it is at best but secondary when we have the "Book of Life" open before us, and on this alone we rely for our refutation of Popery. But Pope Pius and Dr. Challoner (although there has lived about five-and-twenty Popes between, from the death of the one to the other,) both knew that of those called "holy Fathers," by Papists (none of which could surely be *more* holy than infallible Pontiffs?)—yet even of these the above gentlemen both knew the, by far, greater part were the most *unholy* monsters in existence *.

We have noticed the text quoted from Matthew, (ch. v. 25. *see* p. 24,) but that the Pope should have been so indiscreet as

* Jurieu, although not the most quotable of theological writers himself, in quoting Petrarch, (who wrote in the fourteenth century,) says, "He reckons up all the villanies of the *Neros*, *Heliogabaluses*, *Sardanapaluses*, and *Caligulas*—he addeth the *wickednesses, as feigned by poets*, &c. &c. &c.,—and finds all these *too little to afford a true idea* of the *corruptions of the Church of Rome* in that age; so that he requests the *return* of *Nero*, and the *resurrection of the greatest monsters of impurity and cruelty*, as a *less misery* than that 'the Church' was oppressed by." It cannot be *disproved* (however it may be sought to *disguise* the fact,) that since Popery insisted upon her "infallibility" all *Christian charity* has been rooted out of her Church. Her *supremacy* has tagged all her canons and edicts with anathemas—she has openly avowed herself the *damning* Church, by cursing all the world, herself only excepted; we hear of none other who shall be saved; but from her "Child's First Catechism," to her decrees canonical, we are struck with astonishment and contempt at the impotent thunder of her denunciations.

to have introduced it above for the purpose of proving his Purgatory by Scripture is rather surprising, even though he addresses himself to Papists; since, although they are taught to believe every thing they are *desired* to believe, yet the *fewer* contradictions to the evidence of their senses (we should have thought) the better. The Pope, however, certainly knew the calibre of the consciences of his followers better than we do. Still, we must say, that had he applied the above text to those whom his Church denounced as heretics, when seizing upon their estates, and afterwards clapping them into her Inquisitions, we think he might have handled the subject better: as it is, *could* it have been managed *worse?* The chapter from which the extract is taken, (Matt. v.) is the beginning of Christ's Sermon, in which he declares who are blessed, exhorting all to labour after perfectness, &c. However the Pope, or St. Cyprian, may have applied the doctrine of—"Agree with thine adversary quickly whilst thou art in the way with him," &c., to *Purgatory,* God blessed others of his creatures with common sense as well as St. Cyprian * and the Pope; but the cause must be weak, indeed, whose advocates are compelled to the tergiversation of reducing so explicit a command of Christ to a mere Popish *figure!* The next quotations (Matt. xii. 32.) as the Pope tells us "*imply,*"—and then comes his "*otherwise, why,*" followed by the logical, "*Now, if,*" and *then* his own conclusions as positive facts. We deny his proposition; if we disprove it, his conclusion falls. Our Saviour undoubtedly used these words: "Whosoever

* St. Cyprian, although an early father, and an ornament of the Christian Church, was not "infallible." He was converted from Paganism A. D. 246. In 248 the Bishop of Carthage dying, Cyprian succeeded him in the Bishopric, and ultimately suffered martyrdom A. D. 258, twelve years after his conversion. Mosheim says of him, that "he would have been *a better writer,* had he been *less attentive to the ornaments of rhetoric*—and a *better Bishop,* had he been able *to restrain the vehemence of his temper,* and to *distinguish with more acuteness between truth and falsehood.*" The Pope, we think, had better have quoted some other Holy Father. Cyprian denied the *supremacy* of Stephen, Bishop of Rome, whose excommunication he treated with contempt; he also wrote *against* the *vanity of idols,* &c.; speaking of the arrogance of Victor, when Pontiff, he says (*Epist. ad Maximus,* 54,) "This is proud obstinacy and sacrilegious presumption, and proceeds from a wicked madness."

speaketh against the Holy Ghost it shall not be forgiven him, neither in this world, neither in the world to come." We have already said (p. 113,) the Scriptures are addressed to us in a language adapted to our *capacities:* in such a language did Christ and his Apostles preach. But why did neither the Pope nor the Doctor tell their followers (whom we so often feel it necessary to observe, know no more of the Scriptures than Popish doctors *do* tell them,)—*who* it was to whom Christ used the expressions quoted above? Was it not to the *Pharisees?* Those who determinately resisted the authority of his heavenly mission, and yet, who declared that in "the world to come," both soul and body was to be affected by prolonged rewards or punishments according to their lives on earth *? This people *did* deny Christ, and the power of the Holy Ghost in him; *to whom* Christ, knowing their professions and their hypocrisy, said, that such a sin should not be forgiven them in this world, (and, as they professed a belief in an indefinite term of rewards and punishments hereafter,) "neither in the world to come." How, we ask, in his human nature, *could* our Saviour have adapted his language more clearly to the comprehension of those to whom he addressed it?

We are next referred to 1 Pet. iii. ver. 18, 19, 20, but before we say anything further on this subject, we must beg here to remark on the inconsistency of so repeatedly *referring* those to the Scriptures who are absolutely forbidden to peruse them; and those who might persist in doing so, after the prohibition of a priest, would be denied a participa-

* At the time of the birth of our Saviour, the Jewish Doctors had many disputes concerning how the (old) law ought to be expounded. Their opinions being divided, they formed themselves into various sects, of which the three principal were the Pharisees, Sadducees, and Essenes. The two former are frequently spoken of in the New Testament: the tenets of the latter are recorded by Josephus, Philo, (an Hellenistic Jew,) &c. The Essenes believed that future rewards and punishments extended to the soul alone, which was imprisoned in the body, and which they deemed corrupt. The Sadducees assigned the same period of existence to both soul and body as concludes this mortal life. Whilst the Pharisees contended that divine rewards and punishments affected both the soul and body, and that their duration was prolonged beyond the limits of this transitory state.—*Mosheim.*

tion in the sacrament of the Lord's Supper, which is by that very priesthood made an essential to salvation *! Even some Papists may feel somewhat *curious* to know the *cause* of the Scriptures being only thus referred to instead of being quoted, if they have not yet discovered it; and to those who have not, we beg, once for all, to explain the "mystery," it is this—the Pope *could not* extract *fairly* from Holy Writ without overturning his own *arguments;* either on the subject in hand, (whatever it be,) or some other of the "mysteries" of his "Church." Thus Peter's affirmation, as that of Christ and Paul, the "quickening of the *Spirit*," is always evaded, if possible, lest it should sound with conviction on the ears of those taught to believe that their soul's health is secured by real flesh and blood! The verses alluded to are these:—

Ver. 18. "Christ also hath ONCE suffered for sins, the just for the unjust, that he might bring us to God, being *put to death in the flesh*, but *quickened* by the *Spirit*.

Ver. 19. *By which* also he went and preached unto the spirits in prison.

Ver. 20. Which *some time* were disobedient when once the long suffering of God waited in the days of Noah while the ark was preparing, wherein few, that is, eight souls, were saved by water."

This prison, the Pope says, "*could be no other place than Purgatory;* for as to the spirits that were in the prison of

* We hazard no assertions, as facts, which we are not fully assured of being so. Not only would Popery deny what she calls her cup of salvation to any of her flock who presumed to read the Scriptures against the command of her Priest, but to those guilty of what, we suppose, a still less *crime* in her own eyes, namely, an intention of going, under any circumstance, if it *could* be avoided, into a Protestant Church to hear the service performed. Thus, if a wife be a Romanist, and her husband a Protestant, (however great a libertine,) it would be, by Popery, accounted *sinful* of her to reclaim him if, in so doing, she *voluntarily* accompanied him to hear a *Protestant* sermon, (though he would not have gone to church without her) however fraught with pure Christian charity it might be. The purity of her object would be no extenuation of her *guilt* in listening to the most edifying discourse on the excellence of Christian charity, preached by a Protestant Divine; and, did she not pledge herself to forsake so "*contaminating* a *heresy*," (husband and all!) she would be denied what the Priest would assure her was the *only means of obtaining salvation; viz. his baked wafer*, and pardon of sins!!!—Our readers may rely upon this fact, however it may surprise or disgust them.

hell, Christ did *certainly not* go to preach to them." Are we to believe the bare assertion of Pius in preference to St. Peter? This we cannot do; but as the Pope declares himself (p. 52) to have "derived his lineage" direct from the Apostles, his predecessors ought, we think, to have been better informed upon the subject than to have left it to himself to bungle through it in the best way he could. But does Popery teach one doctrine to young children, and another to those who are older? If not, how is it we hear nothing of *Limbo* throughout this whole chapter *? As this is the place of "*rest*" in hell, where Popery intends to go (supposing she would not wish a more uneasy situation), she should not have forgotten to speak of it altogether whilst in the midst of her own Purgatory, seeking scriptural proofs? Her *traditionary* allusions are by no means of the most convincing kind, and might have carried more weight even in the minds of those to whom they are addressed, had she manufactured and sworn to the truth of one of her own invincible miracles. Instead of this, however, here is a solitary reference to an apocryphal composition—a book rejected by the Jews from their canons, and from whom we received them, with the acknowledgment of that fact by Augustine, to whom an appeal is made †!—The last paragraph of this

* Popery having "decided" that she would have a Purgatory for the purification of the Saints of her own making (the necessity of which was obvious whilst they were here on earth) was obliged, in her own defence, to insist upon all holy men who lived before the time of our Saviour sojourning there also. This arrangement was attended with some difficulties—(as in the case of the holy Prophets to whom the SUPREME delivered his commands, &c.)—but the *Infallibility* of Popery surmounted every obstacle. She made a place of "*rest*" for Saints, in hell, which she calls *Limbo:* a place, however, that we seldom hear her speak of; nor, indeed, do we find it in any of her modern books save when *instructing* (!) *children.* We copy the following brief account of it from the *approved* "Child's First Catechism":—

Q. Whither did the soul of our Saviour go after death?

A. His soul went down into that part of Hell called *Limbo.*

Q. What do you mean by Limbo?

A. I mean a place of *rest* where the souls of the Saints were.

Q. Did none go up to Heaven before our Saviour?

A. No; they expected him to carry them up thither.

It will not be denied, we presume, that Popery, by her own shewing, is as well versed in the "mysteries" of Hell, as though she had originally emerged from thence.

† As Pius thought it might suit his purpose to refer to what St. Augustine *said* the Church accepted in his day, we will refer our Popish readers to a more ancient

really curious production commences with telling us what the writer of it is pleased to denominate *reason*; we have already seen enough of Popish reasons to satisfy our minds of the (to use the mildest term) unreasonableness of them; and from her mere deductions from her own premises, we gladly turn to the Scriptures, from which, as the Pope could not find any texts therein to prove that there *is* a place of Purgatory, we proceed to show that there is *not*.

Eccles. ix. 56. "For the living know that they shall die, but the *dead know not any thing, neither have they any more reward, for the memory of them is forgotten.* Also, *their love and their hatred, and their envy, is now perished;* neither have they *any more a portion for ever in any thing that is done under the sun.*"

Matt. xxv. 34, 41. "Then shall the king say unto them on his right hand, Come, ye blessed of my Father, inherit the kingdom prepared for you *from the foundation of the world.* Then shall he say also unto them on the left hand, Depart from me ye cursed into *everlasting* fire prepared for the devil and his angels."

Mark. xvi. 16. "He that believeth and is baptized shall be *saved,*—he that believeth not shall be *damned.*"

Luke xvi. 26. "And besides all this, between us and you there is *a great gulf fixed;* so that they which would pass from us to you *cannot; neither can they pass to us that would come from thence.*"

Luke xxiii. 42, 43. "And he [the penitent thief upon the cross] said unto Jesus, Lord, *remember me* when thou comest into thy kingdom? And Jesus said unto him, Verily I say unto thee, *to day shalt thou be with me in Paradise.*"

John ix. 4. "I must work the works of him that sent me *while it is day;* the night cometh when no man can work."

---

authority, St. Jerome. The latter at the age of eighty died, Sept. 420: the former was Archbishop of Canterbury in the early part of the seventh century. St Jerome says, the Apocryphal Books were *not* to be accounted, and were *not* in the canons of the Church—*Inter Apocrypha esse ponenda—non sunt in canone.* Prologus Galeatus.

1 John i. 7. "The blood of Jesus Christ *cleanseth us from all sin.*"

Rev. xiv. 13. "Blessed are the dead which die in the Lord *from henceforth*; yea, saith the Spirit, that they may rest from their labours; and *their works* do follow them."

Are not these texts sufficiently plain, and clear proofs that mankind must be saved or condemned by *their own works*, and that the Pope's Purgatory will not avail? We could produce pages filled with similar evidences if they be not so. Works of supererogation are clearly forbidden: "Let no man beguile you of your reward," says St. Paul (Col. ii. 18), "in a voluntary humility, and worshipping of angels, *intruding into those things which he hath not seen*, vainly puffed up by his fleshly mind." We have proved by the Scriptures (if Papists will admit scriptural proofs) that what the Pope is pleased to say he calls "Purgatory," is not the doctrine of Christ; and the reason we say less upon the subject than we should otherwise do, is, because the Pope's essay upon it is, we think, so very miserably managed. Christ said (Luke v. 20), "Man, THY SINS ARE FORGIVEN THEE," not that they *shall be* forgiven thee after thou hast been in *Purgatory;* and as all mankind are sinners, not one of whom can be saved by their own merits, but by the merits of Christ alone, it appears rather strange to us how Popery can supply herself with superabundant merits to *release* souls from the Purgatory she sends them to, as she cannot have more virtues than she absolutely requires upon her own account; since the greatest of saints could but be saved through DIVINE MERCY, "For in the sight of God shall no man living be justified. There is *none righteous, no not one.*" Of this we are certain:—the sins which Popery in her *charity* is pleased to call *venial*, and which she professes to burn out by her Purgatory after death, is a doctrine well calculated to cause a greater indifference to committing them in this life. After all, we are still inclined

to think the most effectual applications *to* the Church of Rome are by the "*alms*," and for *these*, in return, she releases all she *sends* to Purgatory by her prayers. We will not suppose her to be so uncharitable as to keep the "faithful" in torment *afterwards*.

In the fifth century, many who called themselves Christians, still preserved a great part of the rites and ceremonies of their *pagan* ancestors, "concerning departed souls, demons, heroes, temples, &c., deforming the religion they professed, by mingling with it these remains of paganism." In the tenth century, the bounty of the ignorant "faithful" had rendered the Romish priesthood as luxurious as corrupt; and Purgatory was one of their most fruitful sources of superstition and wealth. "The fears of Purgatory,"—says Mosheim, "of that fire which was to destroy the remaining impurities of departed souls, were now carried to their greatest height, and exceeded by far the terrifying apprehensions of infernal torments; for they hoped to avoid the latter *easily*, by dying enriched with the prayers of the clergy, or covered with the merits and mediation of the saints; while from the pains of purgatory they *knew* there was *no exemption*. The clergy, therefore, finding these superstitious terrors admirably adapted to increase their authority and to promote their interest, used every method to augment them, and by the most pathetic discourses, accompanied with monstrous fables and fictitious miracles, they laboured to establish the doctrine of purgatory, and also to make it appear that they had a mighty influence in that formidable region."

Chap. VIII.—Of the Veneration and Invocation of Saints.

What is the Catholic *doctrine touching the veneration and invocation of saints?*

We are taught, 1st., That there is an honour and veneration due to the angels and saints. 2dly. That they offer up prayers to God for us. 3dly. That it is good and profitable to invoke them; that is, to have recourse to their intercession and prayers. 4thly. That their relics are to be had in veneration.

SECT. I.—*Of the Veneration of the Angels and Saints.*

How do you prove that there is an honour and veneration due to the angels and saints?

Because they are God's angels and saints, that is to say, most faithful servants, courtiers, friends, and favourites of the King of kings, who, having highly honoured him, are now highly honoured by him, as he has promised, 1 Sam. ii. 30. "Them that honour me I will honour."

2dly. Because they have received from the Lord most eminent and supernatural gifts of *grace* and *glory*, which make them truly worthy of our honour and veneration, and therefore we give it them as their due, according to that of the Apostle, Rom. xiii. 7. "Honour to whom honour is due."

3dly. Because the angels of God are our guardians, tutors, and governors; as appears from many texts of scripture, *Ps.* xci. 11, 12. "He shall give his angels charge over thee to keep thee in all thy ways: they shall bear thee up in their hands, lest thou dash thy foot against a stone." Matt. xviii. 10. "Take heed that ye despise not one of these little ones; for I say unto you, that in heaven their angels do always behold the face of my Father that is in heaven." Heb. i. 14. "Are they not all ministering spirits, sent forth to minister for them who shall be heirs of salvation." It is therefore evidently the will of God that we should have a religious veneration for these heavenly guardians. Exodus xxiii. 20, 21. "Behold I send an angel before thee to keep thee in the way, and to bring thee into the place which I have prepared: beware of him, and obey his voice, provoke him not, for my name is in him."

4thly. Because God has promised to his saints a power over all nations, Rev. ii. 26, 27. "He that overcometh and keepeth my words unto the end, to him will I give power over the nations, and he shall rule them with a rod of iron—even as I received of my Father." Rev. v. 10. "Thou hast made us unto our God kings and priests, and we shall reign on the earth." Therefore all nations ought to honour the saints, as having received from God this kingly power over them.

5thly. Because we have instances in scripture of honour and veneration paid to the angels by the servants of God. See Joshua v. 14, 15.

6thly. Because the church in all ages has paid this honour and veneration to the saints, by erecting churches, and keeping holidays in their memory: a practice which the *English* Protestants have also retained.

Do you then worship the angels and saints as gods, or give them the honour that belongs to God alone?

No, God forbid; for this would be a high treason against his divine Majesty,

What is the difference between the honour which you give to God, and that which you give to the saints?

There is no comparison between the one and the other. We honour God with a sovereign honour, as the Supreme Lord and Creator of all things, as our first beginning and our last end: we believe *in him alone;* we hope in him alone: we love him above all things. To him alone we pay our homage of divine adoration, praise, and sacrifice: but as for the saints and angels, we only reverence them with an inferior honour, *as belonging to him, for his sake, and upon account of the gifts which they have received from him.*

Do you not give a particular honour to the Virgin Mary?

Yes, we do, by reason of her eminent dignity of *Mother of God*, for which "all generations shall call her blessed," *Luke* i. 48. As also by reason of that fulness of grace which she enjoyed in this life, and the sublime degree of glory to which she is raised in heaven. But still, even this honour, which we give to her, is infinitely inferior to that which we pay to God, to whom she is indebted for all her dignity, grace, and glory.

As it was ever a custom of the heathen to offer adoration to the favourite idol wrought of his hand, so is it with Popery to place the *Saints of her own making* on an equal footing with those inspired by the Holy Ghost, and thus commanding of her votaries a sinful "veneration" to be paid to the very images of wretched "worms of the earth," many of whom when living, were the "accursed of God," and a disgrace to humanity.

When God sent his messenger to Eli, who prophesied against his (Eli's) house for its crimes, we defy Popery to twist into an *allusion* to the will-worship of saints a single expression of the whole chapter referred to; what has the part of God's message quoted, "them that honour me, I will honour," to do with the worshipping of Saints? "Honour to whom honour is due," is the next half-line selected; but does the Apostle who spoke it declare there is any worship "*due to Saints?*"—No such thing: the whole chapter consists in exhortations to various duties, and in the first verse says, "*There is no power but of* God; and the last (the 14th) runs thus:—"But put ye on the Lord Jesus Christ, and make not provision for the flesh to *fulfil the*

lusts thereof." Does this imply a command to worship saints? Instead of the Angels being our "governors," &c. in the Psalm quoted, they are represented as the *servants* of the godly, who, as the very next verse states, "shall tread upon the lion and adder," &c. The Pope scarcely need have quoted Matthew (ch. xviii. 10) to have shown that the angels of God dwell in heaven.—Does *this* prove that we are commanded to *pray to them?* The passage selected from the Hebrews is also taken from such a chapter as we should ourselves have quoted from to prove the unscriptural doctrine of Popery upon the present subject. It is in proof that our Saviour is *to be worshipped* BY ALL ANGELS. Paul says (Heb. i. 6), "Let *all* the angels of God worship HIM:"—and (ver. 13)—"to which of the angels said HE at any time, sit on my right hand until I make thine enemies thy footstool? Are they not *all ministering* spirits," &c. Both the Pope and Doctor appear to have been resolved on giving a new signification to the word "*ministering;*" but when the angels ministered to our Lord (Matt. iv. 11), do the above gentlemen wish the sentence to be understood, that they "governed, tutored,"—*or served?* Protestants believe it, as it is expressed, in the latter sense. Is it (Ex. xxiii.) because the Almighty empowered an angel to conduct Moses, that angels are to be worshipped, contrary (as we shall show) to his positive commands?

Of the two texts extracted from the Revelations, we have merely to observe, that the *first* is addressed to the Church of Thyatira (*not* to the Romish Church), and is a repetition of the promises of our Lord to all those who keep his commandments—"But that which ye have already, hold fast till I come:" although this sentence precedes the Pope's *misquoted* extract as above—(he has omitted "as the vessels of a potter shall they be broken to shivers," as the Romish Church is shivered)—it was deemed prudent to pass it by; Popery not having been hatched into existence for ages afterwards—her tenets, opposed to Christianity, are before th_e

reader. By the *second* extract, the Pope would wish it to be understood that he *ought* to have been king of all the earth—the arrogant wish of all Popes*; but the quotation we are speaking of (Rev. v. 10), proceeded from the lips of saints and angels in *offerings of adoration to God.* Does *this* prove that we should worship *them?* When Joshua worshipped an angel, it was not until the angel told him that "*he was armed with the power of the* MOST HIGH:" "As Captain of the Host of the Lord am I now come," said the heavenly messenger:—Does *this* prove that we are, instead of devoting our whole thoughts to God in earnest prayer, to worship angels? The sixth "Because" is, that the "veneration," &c. paid to saints and angels has been the practice in all ages. As this is a *mistake* which we will rectify by showing its *origin*, we will merely observe, by the way, once more, that Popery would do better by vindicating (if she can do so) her own profession by scriptural proof of their truth, than by telling her followers what *Protestants* do. The doctrines of the latter are the doctrines of CHRIST. We have already spoke of days of their *obligation*, &c. (*See* p. 81.) In reply to the next query, the answer is, "No, God forbid!" We disapprove of this *teaching* to break the third commandment (by Popery called the *second*); nor can we distinguish the devotion of Papists to Saints from their devotion to their CREATOR, save that they pray *ten times as often* to Saints as to God:—Popery cannot deny that she has ordained *ten "Ave Marias"* to be said to *one Pater Noster?* However unimportant slight mis-quotations may be in themselves, we cannot approve of them in a "Profession of Faith;" especially where they occur so often as to render it impossible to suppose them accidental errors. The line from St. Luke, "all generations shall call *her* blessed," urged as a Papal plea for worshipping the Virgin Mary, is incorrect; nor, as it is implied,

* *See* Coronation of the Pope, chap. xi.

was the expression used by any person *to* her, but thus spoken by, and of, herself to her cousin Elizabeth—"from henceforth all generations shall call *me* blessed," &c. But as the Pope has said above, that "his flock" honour the Virgin Mary with an "infinitely inferior honour" to that which they pay to God, we will show what kind of "honour" is paid, by Popery, to saints in general; begging that we be understood as making a wide distinction between those of God's creatures whom He himself deigned to distinguish by the gift of his holy spirit, and such wretched and sinful beings as Popery in her vanity has sometimes thought fit to canonize, and of others of an *imaginary* kind, as a standing memento of her own flagitiousness.

The "veneration" for departed Saints (as Mosheim tells us) first appeared among the numerous corruptions of the fourth century*; and in the fifth, it was readily believed that the souls of these Saints travelled again to this world, and hovered about those places where the remains of their bodies were interred; and, in consequence, the superstitious multitudes made the sepulchres the places of fervent prayer. In the eighth century, Christians were taught to rely upon the merits of departed saints for their salvation, and upon donations, or, as they were called, *oblations*, to the *Church*. Thus the people were lost in their idolatry, whilst their clergy, almost as ignorant as themselves, fattened upon their substance; and in the ninth century, ready-made Saints,† who

* Dr. Chandler says, "As the primitive Christians had any intervals from persecution they became more profligate in their morals, and more quarrelsome in their tempers. As the revenues of the several Bishops increased, they grew more ambitious," &c. Speaking of some of the most eminent of Popish-made saints, he says, "Even those whom superstition hath dignified by the name of saints, Athanasius, Chrysostom, Gregory, Cyril, and others, grew wanton with power, and cruelly oppressed those who differed from them, and stained most of their characters with the guilt of rapine and murder."

† For a full account of these we must refer our readers to the *Devotions of the Roman Church* (1674), wherein Popish breviaries, missals, and legends are quoted at large: from the above may be obtained an acquaintance with the *Seven Sleepers*, who took a nap for 362 years, and *thought* it only *one night*; also with the 11,000 English virgins, all butchered together at *Cologne*; besides St. George, (dragon and

had never existed, were named by designing priests to furnish a supply of tutelar deities for the credulous*, until the ecclesiastical councils themselves were actually obliged to set *limits* to the superstition and idolatry they had inculcated†.

But we now speak of a saint of the highest order, the Virgin Mary,—yet, as God's creature only, not in the impious language of Popery. In the tenth century, the rosary and crown were introduced, and masses said in her honour, as a divinity (*See Mosheim, vol. ii. p.* 115. *En. Tran.*); and in the thirteenth, Bonaventura (a Popish saint, of whom we shall again have occasion to speak) published *The Psalter of the Blessed Virgin*, wherein, throughout the 150 Psalms it contains, he has substituted the *name* of the *Virgin Mary* for the name of GOD !—Is this showing Saint Mary an "*infinitely inferior*" honour to that which is due to God?—*The Devotion of Bondage; or, the practice of perfectly consecrating ourselves to the service of the Blessed Virgin* (*permissu superiorum*, 1632,) is printed in English, and which says (p. 32), "*The Sovereign Dominion was given Her not only over the world, but over the* CREATOR *of the world*," &c.—Is this showing "inferior honour?"—After the publication of Bonaventura, followed the *Index Expurgatorius* of the Council of Trent, by which (Session 18) the command that "God only is to be worshipped" is *expunged*, as taught by the ancient Bishops, that the people might be the more readily confirmed in the idolatry of worshipping saints‡, &c.

---

all,) with innumerable other such *saints* and legendary matter, the truth of which no thorough good Papist dare (publicly) deny it is sinful to believe in and to pray to, since there are offices for them, with prayers, &c.

* "The more that any ambitious fanatic departed from the dictates of reason and common sense, and counterfeited the wild gestures, and the incoherent conduct of an idiot, or a lunatic, the surer was his prospect of obtaining an eminent rank among the heroes and demi-gods of a corrupt and degenerate Church."—*Mosheim.*

† *Ibid.*

‡ *Adorari solus Deus est:* Deleatur ex Ind. Operum *Athanasii* Indice Lib. Prohib. and Expurg. p. 52, *Madrit.* Anno 1627. Item ex In. Op. S. *Angust.* Ibid. p. 56.

Hence such publications as "The Devotion of Bondage," "The Garden of the Soul," &c. From the latter (in most general use at the present day) we extract the following passage, which commences the *Litany of the Virgin Mary*:—"We fly to THY patronage, O holy Mother of God; despise not our petitions in our necessities, but *deliver us from all dangers*, O ever glorious and blessed Virgin * !"—Is this not praying for direct aid, without mentioning any *intercession*—or is it the way Popery evinces an "infinitely inferior" degree of honour towards Saints than to their Creator? —That the idolatry of worshipping creatures is contrary to the Scriptures, we give the following proofs:—

Exod. xx. 3. "Thou shalt have no other gods before me."

Isaiah xlii. 8. "I am the Lord: that is my name: and *my glory will I not give to another; neither my praise to graven images.*"

Acts x. 25, 26. "And as Peter was coming in, Cornelius met him, and fell down at his feet, and worshipped him. But Peter took him up, saying, *Stand up; I myself also am a man.*"

Acts xiv. 14, 15. "When the men of Lystra would have worshipped the Apostles (Barnabas and Paul), the latter rent their clothes, saying, Sirs, why do ye these things? *We also are men of like passions with you*, and preach unto

* Some of the ancient Bishops (Epiphanius, &c.) say, that our Lord foreseeing the superstition that would spread through the world on account of his mother, was always reserved towards her—not once addressing her by the appellation of *mother*,—not even when upon the *cross*—nor by any other term than *woman*.—*Woman, what have I to do with thee* (John ii. 4).—He also says (Luke ii. 28), rather blessed are they that hear the word of God and keep it, than the womb that bare him. Neither is the Virgin Mary spoken of as having seen him after his resurrection—she is but once mentioned in the Acts of the Apostles (Acts i. 14), as continuing *with other women* in their communion after the Lord's ascension; and, notwithstanding what the Popish legends say, there are not only *no acts nor miracles* recorded of her in the Acts of the Apostles, but she is *not once named in any of the Epistles*.—Yet, at the ceremony of the Mass the elements are offered up to God, it is said, in memory of the Passion, Resurrection, and Ascension, of Jesus Christ, and *for the honour of the Virgin Mary*, &c.—Where is it to be found in the Scriptures that our Saviour *suffered, rose*, and *ascended, for her honour*, and the honour of other Saints? Not anywhere.—It was for the honour and glory of God—an honour in which *no* Saint could participate.—It is enough for the most holy of Saints that Christ *redeemed* them;

you that ye should turn from these vanities unto the living God which made heaven and earth," &c.

Rev. xix. 10. "I (John) fell down at his (the Angel's) feet to worship him, and he said unto me, *See thou do it not;* I am thy *fellow-servant,* and of thy brethren that have the testimony of Jesus; WORSHIP GOD; for the testimony of Jesus is the spirit of prophecy." This command was repeated upon a similar occasion—(*See* Rev. xxii. 8, 9). If these proofs be not sufficient, our readers may readily multiply them, both from the Old and the New Testaments.

The ancient Bishops were decidedly against this idolatrous innovation: Epiphanius * says, it is a heresy practised by the *Collyridians* (an Arabian sect), so called from offering sacrifices of cakes (*collyridæ*) to the Virgin Mary—as they had done to the Moon, as Queen of Heaven, by which appellation they afterwards distinguished St. Mary. Chrysostom, Athanasius, and Augustine, were among those who streuuously opposed the praying to saints, &c. The latter says, when reproving the heathens for their idolatrous worship of gods and demons, they defended themselves thus †:—"We do not worship evil dæmons (or spirits), we worship those whom you (the Christians) call Angels—the powers of the great God, the mysteries of the great God." But Augustine told them, the objects of their adoration must be *evil* spirits, because they required the worship of men; and he quotes the text from Revelations as we have done above (xix. 10.)

We have already spoken of the sin of coupling Popish-made Saints with those who were inspired by the Holy Ghost; and with other holy men and women whom these inspired

---

* He was Bishop of Salamis (Isle of Cyprus) in the fourth century, and wrote against the heresies of his own time; his writings, however, are considered by the learned to savour of the ignorance of the age in which he lived.

† *Non colimus mala Dæmonia, Angelos quos dicitis, ipsos et nos colimus, Virtutes Dei Magni, et Mysteria Dei Magni.* August. in Psal. xcvi.

writers have so denominated; but of those called saints by Popery, many of them are notorious only as the vilest of sinners. Those most guilty of disloyalty and rebellion to their lawful sovereigns, and others who could boast of having caused the greatest number of wholesale massacres—*these* are the description of wretches who are revered as the pet saints of Popery. Thus, *Dominic* was canonized for his atrocities in France; Becket, who was cruelly murdered, ought justly to have been hanged as a traitor to his king: but he was clapped into the calendar by the saintly despot, Alexander III.; and in the beginning of the last century, the Image of Pope Pius V. was manufactured into a *means of grace* (!), because, forsooth, he broke the communion of the Christian Church, absolved Englishmen from their allegiance to their Sovereign, and because he *courageously* professed to assist in person to "*destroy*" a queen, and *liberally* proffered to expend the whole revenue of his Popedom—yea, to the very chalices, crosses, and vestments—(surely this must have shown Popery in her nakedness?)—so that he might but be enabled to accomplish the destruction of Elizabeth *!

But the Roman Catholics of England are not generally aware of the very *appropriate* saints in their calendar who stand ready to be called upon in all cases of emergency. Not only has every Papal parish a patron Saint, but as the Heathens had gods, so have Romanists saints, for fire, water, cattle, &c. &c. &c. For the fire is St. Agatha; for the sea, Saints Clement and Christopher; Gregory and Nicholas for scholars; St. Loy presides over horses, and the peculiar care of pigs is the province assigned to St. Anthony. Particular Saints are also to be invoked under particular diseases: Cornelis cures the falling sickness, Apollonia is no less infallible in the tooth-ache:—we shall not particularize the malady

* See Mr. Townsend's Accus. of Hist., p. 204, with a reference to Catena's Life of Pius V., published at Rome, 1588.

peculiar to *Saint Roche;* but will hope Popish priests are too moral ever to feel the necessity of supplicating his assistance.

SECT. II.—*That the Saints and Angels pray to God for us.*

How do you prove this?

1st, From *Zachariah* i. 12, where the prophet heard an angel praying for *Jerusalem* and the cities of *Judah:* "The angel of the Lord answered and said, O Lord of Hosts, how long wilt thou not have mercy on Jerusalem and on the cities of Judah, against which thou hast had indignation these threescore and ten years?"

2dly, From *Rev.* v. 8. "The four-and-twenty elders fell down before the Lamb, having every one of them harps and golden vials full of odour, which are the prayers of saints." And *Rev.* viii. 4. "The smoke of the incense with the prayers of the saints ascended up before God out of the angel's hand." From which text it is evident, that both the saints and angels offer up to God the prayers of the saints, that is, of the faithful upon earth.

3dly, Because we profess in the Creed *the communion of saints;* and St. *Paul, Heb.* xii. 22, 23, 24, speaking of the children of the Church of Christ, tells them that they have a fellowship with the saints in heaven: "You are come unto Mount Sion, and unto the city of the living God, the heavenly Jerusalem, and to an innumerable company of angels, to the general assembly and church of the first-born, which are written in heaven, and to the spirits of just men made perfect, and to Jesus the Mediator, &c." Therefore the children of the Church of Christ upon earth are fellow-members with the saints in heaven, of the same body under the same head, which is Christ Jesus. Hence the same apostle, *Gal.* iv. 26, calls the heavenly "Jerusalem our mother;" and *Ephes.* ii. 19, tells us, that we are "fellow-citizens with the saints." Therefore the saints in heaven have a care and solicitude for us as being members of the same body, it being the property of the members of the same body to be solicitous for one another, 1 *Cor.* xii. 25, 26. Consequently the saints in heaven pray for us.

4thly, Because, according to the doctrine of the apostle, 1 *Cor.* iii. 8, it is the property of the virtue of charity not to be lost in heaven, as faith and hope are there lost: "Charity," saith St. *Paul,* "never faileth." On the contrary, this heavenly virtue is perfected in heaven, where, by seeing God face to face, the soul is inflamed with a most ardent love for God, and for his sake loves exceedingly his children, her brethren here below: how then can the saints in heaven, having so perfect a charity for us, not pray for us, since the very first thing that charity prompts a person to do, is to seek to succour and assist those whom he loves?

5thly, Because we find, *Luke* xvi. 27, 28, the rich glutton in hell petitioning in favour of his five brethren here upon earth: how much

more are we to believe that the saints in heaven intercede for their brethren here?

6thly, Because, *Rev.* vi. 10, the souls of the martyrs pray for justice against their persecutors who had put them to death: how much more do they pray for mercy for the faithful children of the church?

7thly, In fine, because our Lord, *Luke* xvi. 9, tells us, "make to yourselves friends of the mammon of unrighteousness; that when ye fail, they may receive you into everlasting habitations." Where he gives us to understand, that the servants of God, whom we have helped by our alms, after themselves have got to heaven, help and assist us to enter into that everlasting kingdom.

Our readers have had a fair opportunity of judging for themselves if Popery does not invariably say the most when she is most at a loss *what* to say. This is the second long chapter about her Saints, and we have yet another to discuss upon the same subject; we shall therefore be as brief as we possibly can in noticing such scriptural lines as she has chosen, since, did we pass them by, she would insist upon her followers believing that she had not misapplied them. We again recommend (the chief object of these pages) an earnest perusal of the Scriptures to decide between the Pope and Doctor, and ourselves.

The quotation from Zachariah should have been followed by the next verse, which shows it to be very natural for the Angel to speak to the Almighty in prayer, when the Supreme was actually *talking* with him, as in the present case. Learned Divines have declared this Angel to be CHRIST before he took the flesh;—the same who wrestled with Jacob and *blessed* him; the same who said to Joshua (as quoted in the last chapter), that he was *armed* with the *power* of the *Lord;* HE who bade Moses take off his shoe, as the ground he *then* stood on was holy:—who appeared in the burning bush on Mount Horeb, saying, *I am the God of thy father, the God of Abraham,* &c. To no mere Angel would these positive expressions apply:—we have already shown that to worship such beings is expressly forbidden by the Scriptures.

The chapters of Revelation referred to in the present Section, show that the prayers of saints ascend to Heaven. Christ himself taught that so do the prayers of sinners also, if sincerely offered; but it is not quite so "evident" that from these texts we learn the Angels pray for the most credulous Papist, because he goes to mass, as Popery has laboured to persuade him.

The third *reason* assigned is another of the Pope's logical curiosities; Angels must pray for Romanists, *because* Romanists believe in the communion of Saints!—Saints in *ancient* times were pious people; since Popery commenced making Saints of her own, any monsters, by her *opus operatum*, or ceremonial of canonization, answer the purpose, and Superstition worships them accordingly. The communion of Saints *was*—and with Protestants still *is*—the fellowship and *charity of true Christians*, with each other *here on earth*; and this is the communion of which St. John assures us (1 John i. 3) to be the means entering into fellowship with God; and for which Christ himself prayed (John xvii. 20, 21). When Paul is exhorting the Hebrews to *constancy in faith*, in the extract given, is it because he tells them that they have come unto "the living God," &c., that it is to be understood that angels pray *for* them? But as angels are *spoken of* in the passage alluded to, *that* appears to be quite sufficient. Because Paul tells the Ephesians that through Christ we have "access by one spirit unto the Father," and are "no more strangers and foreigners, but fellow-citizens with Saints and of the household of God," it is said, "*consequently the saints pray for us!*" The chapter of Corinthians alluded to treats of the *Diversity of Spiritual Gifts;* what this has to do with Saints and Angels *praying for us* we cannot see; we recommend the perusal of the whole chapter. "*Charity*" is a delicate theme for a Church to touch upon which has taken it upon herself to curse all the world who treat her

(*now*—thank God!) impotent malice with contempt. The *charity* of Popery towards those whom she loves is not of kin to the charity taught by Christ, who says, *Love your enemies.* Instead, therefore, of writing his *own opinion* of what is charity in heaven, Pope Pius had been better employed, we think, in recommending to his brethren that they should evince a greater portion of it (were it but for their own soul's sake) *on earth.* The allusion to the glutton in hell is an unlucky one: the words quoted are from the very chapter which incontestably proves the non-existence of a Popish purgatory; and the very reply of Abraham is directly opposed to the Pope's assumption:—"Abraham saith unto him ("the glutton"—ver. 29), they (those petitioned for) have Moses and the Prophets; let them hear *them.*" Can there be a greater proof than this that mankind are to rely upon *their own faith*, not trusting to the merits of others?

The sixth *reason* alleged is certainly the most direct and condemnatory of Popery herself of any throughout her whole faith. "The souls of the martyrs" shall be avenged on their "persecutors!"—Let history decide whether the persecutions of Nero, Domitian, Decius, Dioclesian,—or, taking the whole number of the forty-five Emperors, from the predecessor of Nero (Claudius), A.D. 54, until the reign of Constantine, A.D. 306—is Popery, we ask, prepared to show that all the inhuman atrocities exercised upon unoffending Christians, from the death of Claudius to the reign of Constantine, exceeded in cruelty, or have equalled in numerical extent, those which she has herself inflicted upon the Christian world under the very same pretext alleged by these heathen Emperors, viz. *Heresy?* The sword, the rack, the stake, the gibbet—in short, let the *refinements* upon torture, without extinguishing vitality, as practised in her own Inquisitions, answer the first; whilst the reiterated massacres in every country where she has had the power of exterminating all who have sought to free themselves from her galling yoke—*this* is the test that

must furnish a reply to the latter question*. We will merely add upon this subject, may God forgive our enemies†!

In the last paragraph is conveyed another broad hint, that to be liberal to the priest is the surest way to heaven, as he, as it is held out, will help those, when he gets there himself, who *help him here.* We must still express our doubts on this subject, since we rely upon a much better authority for our belief in a contrary opinion. *Abraham, who is the father of us all—was called the friend of God*—(Rom. iv. 16 and Jam. ii. 23). If, therefore, any soul in heaven which had once animated a human body, knew our minds and heard our prayers, would it not be so highly favoured a saint as he?

---

* Our own elegant Addison says, "The most notable way of managing a controversy is that which we call *arguing* by *torture.* These disputants convince their antagonists with a *sorites,* commonly called a pile of faggots. The rack is also a kind of syllogism which has been used with good effect, and has made multitudes of converts. Men were formerly disputed out of their doubts, reconciled to truth by force of reason, and won over to opinions by the candour, sense, and ingenuity of those who had the right on their side; but this method of conviction operated too slowly. *Pain* was found to be much more enlightening than reason. Every scruple was looked upon as obstinacy, and not to be removed but by several engines invented for that purpose. In a word, the application of whips, racks, gibbets, galleys, dungeons, fire and faggot, in a dispute, may be looked upon as Popish *refinements upon the old heathen logic.*"

† Dr. Milner sarcastically observes, (*Let. to Mr. J. Toulmin*), "You next extol the alleged sanctity of the *Protestant* sufferers *called* martyrs, in the *unhappy* persecutions of Queen Mary's reign." The following, we presume, are this Priest's *best* reasons for such persecutions (*Let. XLIX. to J. Brown, Esq.*): "In the first place, when (Roman) Catholic States and Princes *have persecuted Protestants,* it was done *in favour of an ancient religion!*" - - - - "In the second place, if (Roman) Catholic States and Princes have *enforced submission to their Church by persecution,* they were FULLY PERSUADED (*a*) that there is a *Divine Authority in this Church to decide in all controversies of religion,* and that *those Christians* who *refuse to hear her voice,* when she pronounces upon them, are *obstinate heretics.* But on what grounds can Protestants persecute Christians of any description whatsoever? Their grand rule and fundamental charter is, that the *Scriptures were given by God for every man to interpret them as he judges best.*"

(*a*) That Romish Princes and States were "fully persuaded" by Popes and Priests to slaughter their unoffending fellow-beings by wholesale, we needed not Dr. Milner's confirmation to prove; but when men of learning, who boast of their *liberality of sentiment* (!) as Dr. M. does—when *Englishmen thus* justify the bloody work of Popery, well may Papists exclaim that "*Popery is unchangeable!*" Dr. Milner should have known that the *Protestant* is not a *persecuting* religion at all.—Had it been so, surely such tenets as the above would have called forth her most severe sentence of condemnation? It is those very Scriptures denied by Popery that have taught *Protestant* Christians, whilst they propagate and defend the religion of Christ, that His was *not* a persecuting religion.

Yet we are assured (Isaiah lxiii. 16) *Abraham* is *ignorant of us.* Again, we are told positively, that after this life those who were of this world have no knowledge of us. (Job xiv.) The sons of man "*come to honour, and he knoweth it not; and they are brought low, but he perceiveth it not of them.*—(Job xv. 15.) *Hast thou heard the secret of God; and dost thou restrain wisdom to thyself?—Behold, he putteth no trust in his saints.*—(Col. ii. 18, 19, 23.) *Let no man beguile you of your reward in a voluntary humility* (or in being a *voluntary in humility*, in the marginal reference to the original) and *worshipping of angels—not holding the head from which all the body by joints and bands having nourishment ministered and knit together increaseth with the increase of God—which things have indeed a shew of wisdom in will-worship and humility.*—The Apostle says (Rom. xiv. 23)—*Whatsoever is not of faith is sin*—Praying to Saints is any thing but a *faith in* CHRIST; but as Popery makes her own saints, and teaches her followers to believe, that by paying them liberally here, or, in the Pope's own words, "*helping them with our alms,*" "*they* will help us" to *get into heaven,* it is no marvel that those who can thus believe should pursue so *easy* a course to obtain so desirable an end. St. Peter says (Acts viii. 20),—*Thy money perish with thee, because thou hast thought that the gift of God may be purchased with money.* Popery, however, teaches differently—"pay my priests," says she, "and they will help you to get to heaven—when they get there themselves." Surely the scriptural quotation for this *duty* is ill chosen?—"Make to yourselves friends of the *Mammon of unrighteousness;* that when ye fail, they may receive you into everlasting habitations." Such is the extract selected from the 16th chapter of St. Luke. It is certainly the commencement of a precept of our Saviour which merely requires the latter part to complete it; and which will be found at the 13th verse—"*No servant can serve two masters—ye cannot serve God and Mammon.*"—

Papists must make *their own election*—whether they will embrace the doctrines of Christ, or still worship the "Mammon of unrighteousness."

SECT. III.—*Of the Invocation of Saints.*

What do you mean by the Invocation of Saints?

I mean such petition or request as are made to desire their prayers and intercession for us.

Do Catholics pray to saints?

If by *praying to saints*, you mean addressing ourselves to them as the authors or disposers of grace and glory, or in such manner as to suppose that they have any power to help us independently of God's good will and pleasure, we do not *pray to them:* but condemn all such addresses as superstitious and impious. But if, by *praying to saints*, you mean no more than desiring them to pray to God for us, in this sense we hold it both good and profitable to *pray to the saints.*

How do you prove that it is good and profitable to desire the saints and angels in heaven to pray to God for us?

Because it is good and profitable to desire the servants of God here upon earth to pray for us: "for the prayer of a righteous man availeth much," *James* v. 16. *Moses* by his prayers obtained mercy for the children of *Israel*, *Exod.* xxxii. 11, 14. And *Samuel* by his prayers defeated the *Philistines*, 1 *Sam.* vii. 8, 9, 10. Hence St. *Paul*, in almost all his epistles, desires the faithful to pray for him, *Rom.* xv. 30, *Eph.* vi. 18, 19, 1 *Thess.* v. 25, *Heb.* xiii. 13. And God himself, *Job* xlii. 8, commanded *Eliphaz* and his friends to go to *Job*, that *Job* should pray for them, promising to accept of his prayers. Now, if it be acceptable to God, and good and profitable to ourselves, to seek the prayers and intercession of God's servants here on earth; must it not be much more so to seek the prayers and intercession of the saints in heaven; since both their charity for us, and their credit and interest with God, is much greater now than when they were here upon earth.

But does it not argue a want of confidence in the infinite goodness of God, and the superabounding merits of Jesus Christ our Redeemer, to address ourselves to the saints for their prayers and intercession?

No more than to address ourselves to our brethren here below, as Protestants do when they desire the prayers of the congregation; since we desire no more of the saints than what we desire of our brethren here below, viz., that they would pray for us, and with us, to the infinite goodness of God, who is both our Father and their Father, our Lord and their Lord, by the merits of his Son Jesus Christ, who is both our Mediator and their Mediator. For though the goodness of God and the merits of Christ be infinite, yet as this is not to exempt us from frequent prayer for ourselves, so much recommended

in scripture, so it is no reason for our being backward in seeking the prayers of others, whether in heaven or earth, that so God may have the honour, and we the benefit, of so many more prayers.

But is there no danger, by acting thus, of giving to the saints the honour which belongs to God alone?

No; it is evident, that to desire the prayers and intercession of the saints, is by no means giving them an honour which belongs to God alone; so far from it, that it would even be a blasphemy to beg of God to *pray for us;* because whosoever desires any one to *pray for him* for the obtaining of a grace or blessing, supposes the person to whom he thus addresses himself to be inferior and dependent of some other by whom this grace or blessing is to be bestowed.

Have you any reason to think that the saints and angels have any knowledge of your addresses or petitions made to them?

Yes, we have. 1st, Because our Lord assures us, *Luke* xv. 10, that "there is a joy in the presence of the angels of God, over one sinner that repenteth." For if they rejoice at our repentance, consequently they have a knowledge of our repentance; and if they have a knowledge of our repentance, what reason can we have to doubt of their knowing our petitions also? And what is here said of the angels, is also to be understood of the saints, of whom our Lord tells us, *Luke* xx. 36, that "they are equal unto the angels."

2dly, Because the angels of God, who, as we have already seen, are our *guardians*, are always amongst us, and therefore cannot be ignorant of our requests; especially since, as we have also seen from *Rev.* v. 8, and viii. 4, both angels and saints offer up our prayers before the throne of God, and therefore must needs know them.

3dly. Because it appears from *Rev.* xi. 15 and *Rev.* xix. 1, 2, that the inhabitants of heaven know what passeth upon earth. Hence St. *Paul*, 1 *Cor.* iv. 9, speaking of himself and his fellow-apostles, saith, "We are made a spectacle unto the world, and to angels, and to men."

4thly, We cannot suppose that the saints and angels, who enjoy the light of glory, can be ignorant of such things as the prophets and servants of God in this world have often known by the light of grace, and even the very devils by the light of nature alone: since the light of glory is so much more perfect than the light of grace or nature, according to the apostle, 1 *Cor.* xiii. 12. "For now we see through a glass darkly; but then face to face: now I know in part; but then shall I know even also as I am known:" that is, by a most perfect knowledge. Hence, 1 *John* iii. 2, it is written, "we shall be like him (*God*), for we shall see him as he is." Now, it is certain, that the servants of God in this world, by a special light of grace, have often known things that passed at a great distance, as *Elisha*, 2 *Kings* v., knew what passed between *Naaman* and his servant *Gehazi;* and 2 *Kings* vi., what was done in the King of *Syria* his private chamber.

It is also certain that the devils, by the mere light of nature, know what passes amongst us, as appears by the correspondence they hold with magicians, and by their being our accusers, *Rev.* xii. 10. Therefore we cannot reasonably question, but that the saints in heaven know the petitions which we address unto them.

5thly, In fine, because it is weak reasoning to argue from our corporal hearing (the object of which being *sound*, that is, a motion or undulation of the air, cannot reach beyond a certain distance) to the hearing of spirits, which is independent on sound, and, consequently, independent of distance: though the manner of it be hard enough to explicate to those who know no other hearing but that of the corporal one.

Have you any other warrant in Scripture for the invocation of angels and saints?

Yes; we have the example of God's best servants. Thus *Jacob*, *Gen.* xlviii. 15, 16, begs the blessing of his angel guardian for his two grandsons, *Ephraim* and *Manasseh*. "God, before whom my fathers Abraham and Isaac did walk, the God which fed me all my life long until this day, the angel which redeemed me from all evil, bless the lads." The same *Jacob*, *Hosea* xii. 4, "wept and made supplication to an angel." And St. *John*, *Rev.* i. 4, writing to the seven churches of Asia, petitions for the intercession of the seven chief angels in their favour. "Grace be unto you, and peace from him, which is, and which was, and which is to come, and from the seven spirits which are before his throne."

That Popery should be at such excessive pains to make her adorers believe it is their *duty* to invoke the assistance of her saints is no wonder; and the more especially since our Protestant Reformation of Saint-making, among other abuses of her Church, has almost ruined her trade in this single article. We do not *now* hear of the daily manufacture of a batch of Popish saints for particular occasions, lest *heretical* Protestants should expose the hoax. Well, therefore, may Popery take especial care of the stock, ample as it is, with which she has provided herself in the most flourishing times of superstition and bigotry.

The first question is proposed—"*Do* (*Roman*) *Catholics pray to Saints?*" This plain question, we should have thought, might, from the catechism of a *tyro*, have been plainly answered: but, no; that would not have done—

"Your only peace-maker," an *if*, was necessary, and an "*if*" we have accordingly, by which the *sense* of the answer is reduced to this:—If you mean, by not doing, that which we really do; and by doing, that which we really do *not*, why then it is *quite clear*, in this sense, it is good and profitable to pray to our own Saints, which we have purposely made for our own especial purposes. We readily admit the next long passage, until we arrive at the Pope's logic; that is, we admit that *the prayer of a righteous man availeth much*, BECAUSE THE SCRIPTURES TELL US SO; but we deny the Pope's "*now-if-it-be-acceptable*" part of it, because the Scriptures are opposed to such idolatrous worship (*See p.* 163, 4). *Protestants* are again spoken of as acting *similarly to Papists* (!), in desiring the prayers of the congregation*. The *difference* between the Protestant and the Papist in their worship is this:—the former take the Scriptures for their rule of faith, professing their belief that these (*See Church Article, VI.*) contain all things necessary to salvation;—the latter are taught to believe that *their* salvation is vested in Popery.

We are next informed, that by praying to Papal saints (we particularize these, since if there had not been any such the true saints of God would not, at the present day, have been prayed to at all), there is no danger of giving them the honour due to the Almighty. This must be a very fortunate circumstance, if true, and can only have been secured by a Popish miracle; since the most illiterate of Papists would not otherwise possess discrimination to determine the precise degree of "honour" they were to pay, and the point at which they should stop. Our readers will excuse our passing over the Pope's logical deductions—(perhaps they may think we have already given *enough* of these?)—until we arrive at the

* "I exhort, therefore, that, first of all, *supplications, prayers, intercessions*, and *giving of thanks* be made for all men."—*Paul's 1st Epist. to Tim.* ii. 1.

extract from St. Luke: the chapter (15th) from which it is taken, records the parables of the Lost Sheep and the Prodigal Son, in which our Saviour uses the words quoted above: but he does *not* say that this joy shall be evinced *until the penitent receives his reward in heaven.* The expression, as it stands in the 9th verse (as quoted by the Pope) is the *second* time it is stated by our Lord; and to prove that our interpretation of it is correct, we will quote the 7th :—" I say unto you, that likewise joy *shall be* in heaven over one sinner that repenteth more than over ninety-and-nine just persons which need no repentance."—And this is what Popery adduces in proof of Saints having a knowledge of *every penitent on earth!*

The single expression of Paul, " We are made a spectacle unto the world, and to angels, and to men," is eagerly seized on by the Pope, who seems to have forgotten the quotation he himself has made (p. 157) from Heb. i. 14, where Paul says the angels " are sent forth to minister for them who shall be heirs of salvation." Were not, we ask, the sufferings of the Apostles visible to these spirits upon *earth?*—St. Paul, however, decides the point in question much more clearly, whether Papists will believe him not. What *intercession of saints and angels* is deemed necessary in this positive declaration—*There is one God,* and ONE MEDIATOR BETWEEN GOD AND MAN, *the man* CHRIST JESUS? (1 Tim. ii. 5). Popery dare not (publicly) say our quotations are incorrect—let Papists read the Scriptures, and learn *true Christianity.*

4thly. The Pope speaks of his *suppositions*—with these we will have nothing to do, but adhere to the facts of Christ's doctrine. No believer in HIM ever denied that the Almighty has often bestowed superhuman knowledge upon his creatures; but that " *Therefore* we cannot reasonably question, but that the Saints in heaven know the petitions which we address to them," is, we think, a most unreasonable way of

begging—or insisting—upon a conclusion so obviously false, that we cannot, by any means, concede it*. Is it because the Apostles were gifted with the spirit of the Holy Ghost, that we are to cast aside their inerrant commands for the unscriptural doctrines of Popery? If this be not what the Pope *means*, let it be shown wherein Christ or his Apostles commands what *he says*, and we will then readily admit its truth.

We notice the fifth "because," *because* it is the best reason, or rather the only *good* reason we have yet met with throughout the whole "Grounds" of Popery; and, with so good a *philosophical* reason before us, it would seem uncandid to pass it over in silence. We, however, must beg to remark, that Protestants do not deny that their prayers to Saints (did they offer up any) would not avail in consequence of *their distance* from us; but because the SUPREME has commanded that the sacrifice of *a penitent heart* should be offered to HIMSELF ALONE through the merits of our Redeemer.

We are told, *lastly*,—the Pope and Doctor having fagged hard through three long chapters on this work of forbidden will-worship—that Jacob begged a blessing of his angel *guardian*—that guardian angel was GOD HIMSELF, *as it is expressed in the passage quoted:* "The God which fed me all my life long," &c.—The angel was CHRIST, who often appeared before he took upon himself human nature (p. 167). *The same Jacob*, says the Pope, when quoting Hosea, "made supplications to an angel," and it was to the *same angel* (CHRIST) to which Hosea alludes. The benediction of St. John to the seven churches of Asia is certainly not the most applicable text that Popery might have found in the Revelations relating to herself and *Christian* saints; and when these Revelations were written, a *Popish* saint had

* The texts referred to in this paragraph are as unfairly quoted as usual: John (1 Epist. iii. 2) says, "*It doth not yet appear what we shall be;* but when HE *shall appear* we shall be like him."

never existed. It is the impious spirit of Popery alone which has commanded her followers to pray to God's *creatures* instead of their Creator—a spirit which Saint John seems expressly to speak of when he thus predicts *Antichrist:*—(Rev. xvii.)—I saw a woman sit upon a *scarlet*-coloured beast, full of *names of blasphemy*, &c.; and the woman was arrayed in *purple* and *scarlet-colour*, and *decked* with *gold* and *precious stones* and *pearls*, *having a golden cup in her hand full of abominations and filthiness of her fornications; and upon her forehead was written*, MYSTERY, BABYLON *the Great*, *The* MOTHER OF HARLOTS, and ABOMINATIONS OF THE EARTH; and I saw the woman DRUNKEN WITH THE BLOOD OF THE SAINTS, AND WITH THE BLOOD OF THE MARTYRS OF JESUS, &c. It is *these*, and such as these explicit declarations of the Apostles and their divine Master, that has caused Popery to forbid their perusal to those whom she beguiles by her *mystery* of "opening the gates of heaven" to the creatures of her will. Let Popery, for once, be candid, and say, does she herself believe that out of two hundred reflecting Papists she would find two individuals who would vary in their interpretations of the above extract. Surely it is quite as clear as the last few lines of her present "*Section?*"

Of Relics.

What do you mean by Relics?

The bodies or bones of saints, or any thing else that has belonged to them.

What grounds have you for paying a veneration to the relics of the saints?

Besides the ancient tradition and practice of the first ages, attested by the best monuments of antiquity, we have been warranted to do so by many illustrious miracles done at the tombs and by the relics of the saints (see St. *Augustine*, l. 22. *Of the city of God*, cap. 8.) Which God, who is truth and sanctity itself, would never have effected, if this honour paid to the precious remnants of his servants were not agreeable to him.

Have you any instances in scripture of miracles done by relics?

Yes, we read in 2 *Kings* xiii. 21, of a dead man raised to life by

the bones of the prophet *Elisha*. And *Acts* xix. 12, "From the body of Paul were brought unto the sick handkerchiefs or aprons, and the diseases departed from them, and the evil spirits went out of them."

After the long account of the will-worship of Saints, it may be naturally expected that some little should follow on the behalf of their *Relics* and the various *Miracles* which they ever have performed, and (unless the Reformation has sapped their virtue) ever *ought* to perform;—our only surprise is, that so *very* little is said on so fruitful a subject. *Why* the Pope should have treated it with such extreme brevity, and *why* the Doctor should not have added to the Pope's *little* notice above, we cannot imagine, but for two trifling reasons: the first of which is, that, for *consistency's sake*, having hitherto invariably said much where there was little to say, they determined to say as little as possible where they had so fair a field open to them for ample illustration; since an account of Popish relics, and the miracles they have performed, would, we hesitate not to say, of itself form an *extensive library* of wonders. But if this be not the cause of their silence, perhaps it may be found in the comparatively shocking incredulity which took possession of the Christian world, as the *wicked* reform of idolatrous worship blasted for ever the rich harvest of the Roman Church,—sown in superstition, and long reaped by bigotry? However, be the cause of this silence what it may, these gentlemen have been too diffident on a subject which for many ages certainly has constituted the great bulk of their *religion*. This is much to be lamented, since the edification of the "faithful" Papist of by-gone times is much lessened towards the rising generation of Saints, by the silence we complain of.—We regret, too, that the subjects of Relics and Miracles should have been thus jumbled together; since the miraculous properties of the former might have been—as surely such *sacred morceaux ought* to have been—reverently treated of in a separate chapter;—and who will deny that their *opus operatum* deserved not another

or that the Scriptures would not have furnished *equally* copious proofs for the belief in Popish relics and Popish miracles also?—We will speak of these subjects separately—First of *Relics:*—These *means of grace* consist of "the bodies or bones of [dead] Saints, or anything else that has belonged to them," as the Pope tells us; and thus a hair, a nail-paring—a pocket kerchief, or its contents, of a Popish Saint, are charms *equally* potent in their efficacy.

"Monks, adoration of relics, and the spirit of lying, came into the Church of Rome in the same age," says the historian. Extremes ever generate each other; and the most adverse Pagan, once converted, readily became the voluntary dupe of that spirit, believing his own fanaticism to be the surest pledge of his newly-professed faith. A "glowing atmosphere" invited to repose and indolence; and hence a great cause of those *hermits* who led solitary lives in woods and caves before the birth of our Saviour, and which many were afterwards further induced to lead, to escape the persecutions practised against the early Christians. In the fourth century, Antony, of Alexandria, collected a troop of these enthusiasts, and first formed them into a society. His plan was adopted in Syria, Palestine, and Italy. In the sixth century, the number of monasteries had greatly increased, wherein the most wealthy branches of noble families were sacrificed to the gloom of a cloister; whilst the most abandoned profligates were satisfied of a pardon for their crimes, by ending an ill-spent life within its walls, to which they were readily admitted by the monks in consideration of the riches they brought with them; and thus those ecclesiastical drones amassed their treasures, alike from the criminal and the credulous. *Relics*, as a meet accompaniment of monkery, obtained some consideration in the fourth century also; and as Constantine and his imperial family embraced Christianity in this age, the Empress Mother, Helena—probably reluctant to yield up all her Pagan notions of worship at once—while she

professed her adoration of the victim, was the *first* who paid a veneration to the *cross* also *.—Imposture was ever apt at taking a hint. Pieces of the *true* cross were exhibited all over the Papal world, until those who showed them thought it most expedient to have *the identical cross* itself; each party declaring and insisting that their own was the *original;* nor can it be doubted, that if all the wood that the Popish clergy have shown as the cross whereon our Redeemer suffered, could, in the present age, have been collected, it would have afforded materials to have built the largest ship in the British navy! The *original* cross which M. Sonini tells us the old Monk showed him in the East, was not the *only* wonder of the convent—his venerable guide pointed out to him the very hole in the wall through which the Holy Ghost inspired Peter!—A certain portion of the body of our Lord is shown †—several places declaring they have the original—they had one in the Lateran Church at *Rome*, one at *Antwerp*, a third at *Charonne*, a fourth at *Langres*, &c. Salmeron says (*in Evan. Tom.* 3. *Tract* 36) that this relic was given by the Virgin Mary to Mary Magdalen, and that it was afterwards brought by an angel to Charles the Great, at *Aken*, and was by these means preserved in the Lateran. But as, at the Resurrection, the body was *perfect*, it is declared that the *Relic* boasted of belonged to the entire body, *non formaliter, sed materialiter* (not formally, but materially only), which, according to Popish logic, clearly settles the

* To *worship* that which in the most indirect manner aided the sufferings of our Redeemer, may appear strange to those who profess only to worship HIMSELF. There are, however, masses said on account of it on the 3d of May; and, in the course of the ceremony, it is called the "*saving* wood," the "*sweet* wood,"—and the *nails* (so many gross of which have been exhibited to the devotees who brought their *offerings*)—these also are remembered in the pious ejaculations of the "faithful" Papist, and are as gravely addressed as the wood—"*sweet* wood, *sweet* nails," &c.—See "*The Roman Missal.*"—Can Christians think it redounds to the honour of their Saviour, when those who profess to assemble in HIS name thus address themselves to wood and iron?

† We have so many accounts of this impiety before us as detailed by the Papists themselves, that we scarcely know to whom to refer.—See the *Devotions of the Roman Church*, p. 31, where grave writers are quoted at large, among others, Bollandus, *Act. Sanct. ad Jan.* 1. *de præputio Christi*, &c.

matter*. At *Vendome* they show (at least they pretended to do so in the last century) a *tear* of Christ caught from his cheek during his passion. The *nails* of the cross—the *thorns* of the crown—the very *manger* wherein our Saviour was laid (if they have not, in shame, destroyed the cheat)—his shirt, shoes†, &c. &c. &c. are at this day shown at Rome; and whilst the fraudulent exposure of the wood of the cross in one heap would be enough to build a ship, it cannot be denied that there has been shown to the Romish devotees as much of the blood of our Lord, and milk of the Virgin Mary, as would have floated it at anchor!—Such are a few of the frauds practised by Popery, the whole of which would fill thousands of volumes. We know not how to express some of them but in her own terms, impious as they are;—and we, therefore, beg to assure our readers, that we have selected these two or three specimens of Popish *religion* (!) from the mass of them before us as the *least offensive*, as relating to Jesus and the Virgin Mary. Those who may think this incredible (as *Christians*, who have not seen the Popish books to which we allude, very naturally must do) are referred to the accounts given in the *Annals of the Jacobins*‡ (as the Dominicans were called in France), &c. These speak of a conversation between the Virgin Mary and Dominic, to whom she is stated to be married (Dominic *lived in the 13th century*), and made to solicit him in the grossest terms. *Alanus* says she was married to himself; and *Cesærius* relates that she offered herself in marriage to a soldier, &c. &c. We repeat, that the *language* in which these legends are told is most blasphemous, disgustingly fulsome, and vulgar. Besides Relics of every description which are averred to have belonged to Christ, the Apostles, &c. &c. &c., the catacombs were ransacked, to furnish a supply of *bones*, which were to work wonders among

* Suarez, *in* 3 *Part. Qu.* 54. *Act.* 4. *Disp.* 47. *Sec.* 1.

† We do not remember to have read that our Saviour wore any; he is certainly always represented barefooted.

‡ See also *Exceptiones Legales.*

the credulous. But, perhaps, the Relic *Veronica* should be particularized. The Legends tell us, our Saviour gave the napkin with which he wiped his face, on his way to be crucified, to a holy woman, and which retained its impression ever after. This napkin, like the cross, has since *multiplied:* the *original* one at Rome was—and we suppose still *is*—shown publicly on particular occasions; when those blessed by its sight fall down and worship with a wild fanaticism. It was in the ninth century that the relic *mania* first attained to its perfect vigour, when even Avarice was contented to bestow his wealth upon the impostor who furnished him with a toe, tooth, or any other trumpery, said to have belonged to some Saint. "The bodies of the Saints," says Mosheim, "were sought by fasting and prayer, instituted by the priest, in order to obtain a divine answer, and an infallible direction, and this pretended direction *never failed* to accomplish their desires; the holy carcass was *always* found, and that always in consequence, as they impiously gave out, of the suggestion and inspiration of GOD HIMSELF!"—People travelled to the East in search of the bones of the primitive Christians; "the Greeks found a rich prey in the stupid credulity of the Latin Relic-hunters, and made a profitable commerce of this *new* devotion. The latter paid considerable sums for legs and arms, sculls and jaw-bones (several of which were Pagan, and some not human), and other things that were supposed to have belonged to the primitive worthies of the Christian Church; and *thus* the Latin Churches came to the possession of those celebrated relics of St. Mark, St. James, St. Bartholomew, Cyprian, Pantaleon, and others, which they show at this day with so much ostentation. But there were many who, unable to procure for themselves these spiritual treasures by voyages and prayers, had recourse to *violence and theft;* for all sorts of means, and all sorts of attempts in a cause of this nature were considered, *when successful,* as *pious* and *acceptable* to the SUPREME BEING!"

We now return to Pope Pius, who tells his "faithful" that

they are *warranted in their veneration of Relics* by the practice of the *first* ages, and by the *best* monuments of antiquity —these "*best*" of Papal "monuments" are their *Legends;* and these very Legends were, be it remembered, the *Gospels* of Popery for eight hundred years. But where is the *British Roman* Catholic so totally debased as to avow his faith in these fables of impiety? Yet three hundred years ago he would, in England, have been condemned as a heretic, who expressed even a doubt of their authenticity, as he would be now in Spain, &c. That the Pope is *mistaken* in the practice of the *first ages* of Christianity we trust is already proved. The allusion to St. Augustine is not the Pope's happiest hit;—does he wish it to be understood that Augustine either lived in the "first age" of Christianity, that he was a Relic-hunter, or that he affected the power of working miracles? Augustine, we know, was Archbishop of Canterbury in the beginning of the *seventh*, and *not* the *first* age, of the *Christian* world —he never pretended to raise *one* dead man, either by the charms and spells of relics, or by any other means; and, what is more surprising still, there are but *very few* miracles recorded of his performance in the Legends, or by our Venerable Bede, whose *historical*, and *not* his *miraculous*, matter is the memorial of his fame.

We now arrive at the Pope's authority for *the miracles* of his "Church"—and this authority is contained in the above extract from the Bible, which informs us that a dead man, when cast into the sepulchre of Elisha, rose on his feet on touching the Prophet's bones—and that handkerchiefs and aprons from the body of St. Paul cured the sick. Is it, then, because the Omnipotent King of the Universe wrought a miracle by the bones of his Prophet, and empowered his Saint to perform others by the means of kerchiefs and aprons, is it on this account that "poor worms of the earth," whilst "speaking lies in hypocrisy," should have the power of changing *every* dead carcass—that *they*, for their own worldly purposes, may choose to consecrate, with *every* rag

which *they* may think proper to submit to their own vain ceremonies into a *means of grace*, and effect similar ends to the miracles of God, and of those whom he had directly gifted with his authority?—The inculcation of a belief in their miracles, by Popish priests *, is their certain means of establishing a power over the minds of the vulgar; and the latter of every profession are ever too ready to attribute even ordinary occurrences to superhuman, rather than to natural causes. *Because* miracles were wrought by the rod of Moses, the Romish schoolmaster *miraculously* makes a good boy from a bad one by the power of *his own*—every priest's rod (if *consecrated*) becomes a means of *grace*, and an extract from Holy Writ, showing the power of the rod of Moses, would be deemed quite sufficient to prove its infallibility! Papists should know, and knowing, they should believe, that it is not the *examples* of the Almighty God, but his own *institutions* which are bequeathed to us as *means of grace.* Because He, to our confined sense, *miraculously* called forth worlds into the ambient air, called Nature into being, and was pleased to endue some of his most favourable creatures with peculiar powers—are the vain, the ambitious, and the mercenary, to form themselves into a body, and to aver that to *them* is delegated the power of working miracles—a power which Scripture † and Reason deny?—Clothes, linen, or any other thing proceeding from the Apostles, who were filled

---

* The late Dr. Milner, the most redoubtable of the modern champions of Popery, (Miracles and all!) has boldly entered into the very marrow of his subject with much more phrenetic zeal than the Pope himself—and who, we should suppose, will be the chief of the next batch of Papal Saints. *Of course* he sends all to perdition but Papists (*wittily* sneering at Bishops Watson and Hoadley, as he says, for being "indignant" at his "stinting the Omnipotent in the exercise of his mercy")—but on the subject of miracles, *Munchausen* was not more *at home* than *Milner.* It is true, the latter, as well as the former, disbelieves some things he has *heard* of; but he speaks of such multitudes of marvellously-wrought miracles of his brother Saints as it requires the very soul of Popery to credit. We give the following sample in his own words: "In like manner (Roman) Catholics have reason to *complain* of these and other Protestant writers for the manner in which they discuss the *stupendous* miracle that took place at Saragossa in 1640, to one Michael Pellicer, whose leg *having been amputated*, he, by his prayers, obtained *a new natural leg!*"—*End of Con. note, p.* 117.

† Matt. vii. 15—24, &c. &c.

with the Holy Ghost, or from others into whom God had infused his Spirit, might naturally be supposed to work miracles upon those whose faith in Christ was proved by their reliance upon their efficacy—but if Popery, by her consecrated ornaments, or whatever else she may choose to call them, can effect similar blessings to those wrought by the things spoken of which had touched the body of St. Paul, let her hasten to tear up her *chausables*, *albs*, and *amices*, distribute them among the sick, and prove to the world, by healing their diseases, that her very rags are as potent as she declares them to be. But, does not every-day practice show to Papists themselves the folly of such a hope?—The diseased woman who kissed the hem of our Saviour's garment, was instantly made whole—the hem of the priest's garment is ordered to be kissed *twice* during every ceremony of the mass; yet who, save in the Popish Legends, is ever known to be cured of a malady by this part of the performance?—It is not, we repeat, the *examples* God has displayed in his wonderful works that makes them *means of grace* to us; these means are to be found in the *institutions* he has commanded us to keep—as the *Lord's Supper* and *Baptism*.

Having thus replied to the Pope's *little* extract, we will show a few more of the most incontrovertible miracles of his Church, first proving (since the Pope and Doctor have been rather *cautious* on this point) that they still *are* to be believed in by the best of good Roman Catholics. We have said, above, the *most* incontrovertible, because there are some Papists of the present day infected with the heresy of doubt. Mr. Charles Butler himself *affects* to disbelieve that Dunstan took the Devil by the nose, although he is satisfied of the miraculous falling-in of the floor at Calne. "Now," as Pius says, "both faith and reason tell us," that all these Popish Legends are EQUALLY untrue or authentic; and we would hint to the believers in the generality of them, that it is not very *advantageous* to their Church to say otherwise. If any

one of the Apostles—if our Saviour himself could have been proved to have practised *fraud* in any *one* of his miracles, it would have caused a just suspicion of all the others.

We have shown how readily Papal logic fritters away facts into falsehoods; but truth is still truth, and Popish miracles must be either true or false; nor need Mr. Butler be reminded, that had he lived three centuries back, and had presumed to have *doubted* the avowed fact, that the Devil *had* submitted to Dunstan, his present high opinion of Romish miracles *in general* would not have saved him from the stake. There have been many *calling* themselves members of the Romish Church—(all who are *all* Papist—as all Papists *ought* to be—believe *all* their Church bids them believe —pp. 16, 17)—who, like Mr. Butler, have been infected by *doubts;* by such the *rejected* impostures have been "improperly," as Mosheim says, "called *pious frauds*."

In the "Declaration" of the Popish Bishops (p. 18), the belief in their miracles is much more clearly expressed than by what Pius has said above under cover of his *Relics*. These Right Reverend Gentlemen declare that they still "believe that the power of working miracles has not been withdrawn from *the* Church of God"—(*meaning their Popish Church!*)—We heartily wish they would seriously set about exerting the power they say they possess, for the benefit of mankind generally; or, if this be too much to expect of Papal charity, let them, *at least*, restore lost sight, limbs, and health, to the Roman Catholics; and we will be the foremost to acknowledge their merits, and excuse their raising the dead *as they were wont to do, previous to our Protestant Reformation.*

We shall stand excused for passing over in silence the innumerable miracles said to have been wrought by the Relics, &c., of our Saviour, the Virgin Mary, and the Saints of God —they are too blasphemously affirmed by Popery to be repeated:—the two or three we will allude to shall be concerning Popish-made Saints, as the least objectionable, impious

as it is,—"because nothing is impossible to GOD,"—to couple HIS sacred name with such glaring yet undeniable—contemptible yet wicked, impostures.

We will first speak of that notable of Papal Saints, Francis, since, as his "gospels" are still worn, so even among the learned of Romanists of the present day, his miracles are Gospel*—manifest as they are numerous, and quite as *useful* as they are true. One day Francis took it into his head to have a *vision*, in which a cross appeared to him, and to which he offered adoration. But, behold! when he awoke, he had the same wounds in his body as those imprinted on the sacred person of our Saviour. Yea, his side, hands, and feet, showed the *same marks;* and that every one of his friends *might* behold them, we are gravely assured he bore the impression on his person for two whole years!—(It is really painful to couple the sacred name of JESUS with these contemptible Legends; but it must be seen they cannot otherwise be repeated.)—This is the Francis d'Assise, who was employed by his Pope to assist in the extirpation of heretics —(*i. e.* all mankind who did not acknowledge the supremacy of the *Infallible* Innocent the Third!)—"A pious and well-meaning man," says Mosheim, "though *grossly ignorant* and *weakened in his intellects.*"—Many of the murderers of the Albigenses were also "pious" men; but their gross ignorance rendered them the fittest tools for the Popish purposes of blood. From the annalists of Francis, we learn that he preached to *Birds*, which put up their bills in wonder (as well they might), and clapped their wings with joy. He made a covenant with a *wolf* also, that the latter should not devour any more human beings, and to which agreement the latter punctually kept. His rencounters with the Devil are

* Mr. Charles Butler appears perfectly satisfied of the veracity of the annalists of this favourite Saint. He says of the Fable here treated of, in his *Book of the Roman Catholic Church*, that it would be a difficult task to refute any of the learned Franciscans upon the subject. Not having his work readily at hand, we here quote Mr. B.'s observation from memory.

too numerous to be particularized; suffice it to say, he always got the better of him. Of course, it must have been impossible to have lived with so great a miracle-worker without acquiring some knowledge on the subject; and, as might be expected, all the brethren of his order became adepts in this Papal Art. Brother Andrew set some birds flying after they had been roasted for his dinner, and so on, *ad infinitum.* Dominic had (and *we believe it*) as much to do with the Devil as his fellow-labourer, Francis; but one of his miracles we must particularly notice, as it will show the heresy of the Albigenses*, whom he afterwards slaughtered, in its proper light. Resolved on confounding their prejudices, he changed a *dog* into a *cat,* which ran up a bell-rope; yet his victims remained unconvinced, and the cat almost stifled them with offensive exhalations. Swithin performed the important task of making whole a poor woman's broken eggs: Bridget dried her clothes *upon* a *shadow (*she *thought* it had been a TREE), and Aldem his *on* a *sun-beam,* but Cadrac *hung* his staff *on* the *air.* Vincent Ferrier raised *thirty-eight dead men*†; but he was beaten by Jacinthe, who raised *fifty-two.* St. James (who was beheaded by Herod Agrippa in Asia) is the St. *Jago* of Spain, where the good folk travel to Compostello to worship his bones: Dionysius, the Areopagite (the St. *Denis* of France), Bishop of Athens, was broiled on a gridiron at Paris; yet, wonderful to say, was unhurt: he was thrown to lions, who humbled themselves on his showing them a cross; and after many similar escapes, a choir of angels came to his prison where *mass* was sung, in which other pri-

* Notwithstanding the inhuman butchery of this noble and innocent race, Dr. Milner, in the true spirit of Popery, thus speaks of them, when praising one of his Saints:—"Thus preaching at Sarlat against the *impious* and *impure* Henricians, a *species* of Albigenses," &c. Of their murderer in chief he says:—"To these [miracles] I may add the *prodigy* of *Saint* Dominic, who, to prove the truth of the (Roman) Catholic doctrine, threw a book containing it into the flames, in which it remained unconsumed, challenging the *heretics* whom he was addressing to make the same experiment on their creed."—*End of Con.*

† Dr. Milner says, he had the *gift of tongues* also.—*Ibid.* We may, in charity, hope they were not of a similar flexibility to those of his annalists?

soners joined, who were afterwards all beheaded, and then their *heads* continued to sing. As for Denis, he carried *his* head out of the company two miles off, and made a present of this *Relic* to a holy lady, whose name was *Catulla*. The fables of the founding the churches of Our Lady, at Monserrat, Loretto, &c. would be amusing to young children, if *told* as *romantic* instead of *true Romish* Legends; but there are "children of a larger growth" who profess to believe in them. In the first, *a young infant* (the daughter of the first Count of Barcelona) releases a Monk from his enchantments, who had formerly seduced her sister. This infant's sister feeling that, as we are told, she had the Devil in her, she applied to the Monk to drive him out; the Monk readily set about it, when the lady's devil took possession of the Monk himself; and to conceal the outrage he then committed, he murdered his penitent. He then, as is usual in such cases, applied for absolution to his Church; but this, the Legend says, could only be obtained but by the penance of crawling on his hands and knees until a child of three months old should bid him rise. The Monk accordingly went creeping about this way for seven years only, when the infant (as above) said, "Arise, and stand upon thy feet, *Brother* John Guerin," &c. The lady he had *murdered* was afterwards found *alive*, fresh, and beautiful as ever; for she had devoted herself to the Virgin, who had preserved her. The building a convent (could they do less?) was the consequence—of which the young princess became the abbess, and Guerin, very properly, confessor to the young ladies. Every convent has its Legends*. We will

* There is a particular Legend of a certain convent, for which we have sought in vain; but as we know a late Jesuit who was a party concerned in the *miracle* he himself, in his moments of jollity, narrated, we will briefly mention it. [We beg our Roman Catholic friends not to *doubt* the occurrence we are about to speak of, as it was not the *only miracle* that happened to our Priest; since, *wonderful* as it may appear to some good folk, he actually, though not a Pope, was a *papa!*] Some years ago, on an eruption of Mount Etna taking place, the lava descending, forced its way in the direction of one of the numerous convents which are to be found within its neighbourhood: the holy brethren carefully watched its progress until it *ceased to flow*, and *then*, to *stop its ravages*, in full procession, bearing a cross, they solemnly planted it on the verge, marked by the sulphureous matter, which proceeded no further,

speak of the Legend of Loretto, from which we draw the following brief account from matter as impious as it is puerile. After the blasphemous account of the preceding inhabitants of this chamber, of which the Apostles afterwards made a *chapel*, where they sung *mass*, St. Luke, we are informed, drew the Virgin's picture (still shown, or *was* shown a few years ago, as the *original)*, which hung quietly up, and the chapel itself stood contentedly still at Nazareth until A. D. 1291. But, in that year, Palestine being taken by the Mohammedans, off flew the chapel to *Dalmatia*, accompanied by some angels. After a journey of so many thousand miles, it halted, and continued at *Tersanctum*, until the devotional tributes of the pilgrims became less frequent. It then again set off for *Recanati*, the seat of a lady of the name of Loretto: —the chapel alighted in a wood—pilgrims again approached with their offerings; but a band of marauders taking advantage of their zeal, contrived to sally from the wood, and plunder them. The chapel was twice removed by Angels after this; but we *think* it will for the time to come remain stationary. Protestantism is not favourable to Miracles*; and its influence is powerful. But perhaps Protestants may imagine that, as the wonders we have alluded to above are said to have occurred ages ago, they are long since forgotten.

---

to the great admiration of the favoured Sicilians. Such was the Jesuit's *own* account of the transaction, when relating it to his particulars, and at which he would smile at the folly of those whom he assisted in deceiving.—The writer of this note, when commenting upon the above to his Roman Catholic friends, has frequently received, by way of reply, the following question—"*Well! and what harm did it do?*"

* The translator of Bede, Stapleton the Jesuit, says, "No Protestant, while he lived, nor yet his bones or bodie when he was dead, ever wrought any miracle. No Protestant's bodie hath this hundred years been preserved from corruption." This is very true; nor Papist's neither, if truth only were adhered to; but wherever it has been deemed *criminal* to dispute Monkish miracles, the natural consequence was, that such impieties should increase, and be recorded by all Ecclesiastical writers—even those of, otherwise, the highest credit. In such cases the impartial reader has only to make an allowance for the prejudices of the age in which his author wrote—passing over the fables as the concomitant excrescences of superstition grafted upon genius. It will never be difficult to distinguish the writings of Bede from those of Geoffrey of Monmouth, although the former tells of Saints whose bones, by their illumination, saved their convents oil, and of their bodies remaining incorruptible for centuries. It cannot be denied that Protestantism has caused so great a bankruptcy in the firm of Popish miracle-mongers, that they will never be able to obtain an accredited certificate, so as to enable them to carry on their trade upon an extensive scale.

Father Crasset lived in the beginning of the last century, and speaks of them thus :—"The third objection that they make against this doctrine is, that it hath almost no other foundation besides relations and histories, which men are not obliged to believe, and which are reported by simple, over-credulous persons, who take the dreams and imaginations of women for Divine Revelations. It is an *intolerable rashness* to give the name of *Tales* and *Fables* to those *Histories* related by authors eminent for learning and *Holiness ;* and to reckon, as the mistakes of a weak understanding, *such Revelations* as have *merited the approbation of the Council of Basil,* of the *Popes Gregory II., Urban VI.,* and *Martin V.* For my part, I shall not think that I wrong the historians of the age, if I give as much credit to Saint Antonin, who relates that Vincent Ferrier raised eight-and-thirty men from the dead, as I do to all the stories in Gazettes out of which they make their histories *." Why, indeed, should not Papists believe in one of their accredited miracles as well as another?—by what right do *they* presume to make their own *selection from this mass of absurdity and falsehood?*—must not their "Church" which professed, and still (*quietly*, to be sure) *professes* her belief in their genuineness, know better than they ?—Are such miracles as we have noticed—(by no means the *most wonderful,* although some of the least gross of their Legends)—are these more astonishing than those declared by Fathers Murphy, Roche, &c. to have been performed in our own times by themselves? We have an authenticated document at this instant before us—*sworn* to before a bench of magistrates—wherein it is proved that the above-named gentlemen *preached* their power of preserving all those of the true Romish religion from *heretical bullets,* which they themselves caught in their hands, &c. This was *believed* by their

* Dr. Milner says (*End of Con.* p. 110,) "In those processes which are *constantly going on, at the Apostolical See,* for the canonization of *new* saints, *fresh* miracles [the old ones *have* become *stale?*] of a recent date continue to be proved with the highest degree of evidence," &c. Yet, after this, we are assured, (p. 113,) so strict is the examination of their truth, that "it is next to a miracle to *get a miracle proved* at Rome!" Oh! Dr. Milner!

flocks. Why should it not have been, when their Bishops publicly declare their own belief in their own miraculous power?—And *why*, we ask, are Papists told they *ought* to believe in them—"Because nothing is impossible to God."—FALSEHOOD is impossible to HIM who is, indeed, the fountain of all TRUTH—nor can HIS sacred name be more deeply dishonoured than by those by whom it is associated with such fulsome, hypocritical, and insidious frauds as those contained in the Popish annals we have just spoken of.

We have been somewhat more than ordinarily copious in our remarks upon the present subject, from a knowledge that many of our most sensible countrymen and countrywomen, although they *call* themselves Romanists, *cannot* believe *all* the Popish doctrines, however well-inclined to do so, because Reason will not permit it. They would reluctantly give up their miracles, since the power of their Church to work them was deeply impressed upon their minds in youth:—these are, in England, generally, too rational to be intrusted with a perusal of the *Legends* of Monks—and whenever a miracle can be *slily* slipped out, it is still persisted in by those Priests whose great interest, in this world, is to deceive. Even the superstition of the most illiterate Protestants, who, in opposition to the Scriptures and their Clergy, would believe (for superstition is the child of ignorance) anything ridiculously supernatural—these would be encouraged by the Romish Clergy to imbibe the miraculous; and the miracle of Holywell*, attested by the late Dr. Milner, is a *convincing* proof (to Papists) that the fooleries sanctioned by their men of learning ought not to be rejected by themselves. The Romanist who would persuade himself that he need not believe in the mass of absurdities and impieties of his Church,

* Among the innumerable miracles said to have been performed by the *water* of this well, none exceeds the one gravely related by Dr. Milner of Winnifred White, who was cured of an *incurable* disorder (her *medical* Doctor having given it up) by a bit of *moss* ("from the Saint's well") tied round her arm, and repeating Popish prayers for nine days together.

should recollect that this Church is (in England) *afraid* so openly to command it as formerly. Let him apply to his God for instruction through the medium of his own word; and ere he treat with contempt the most contemptible Legend of his Church, let him assure himself that his *every-day worship* is derived from a purer source. Are not the devotions to the Virgin Mary—the festivals of her nativity, assumption, &c. &c. &c.—are not these all founded on the fabulous Legends we have already noticed? If they be not, *where* are they to be found in the Scriptures? We have Legends of the birth, parentage, &c. &c. of the Virgin Mary, among scores of others, now *lying* before us, as quoted by Jurieu, from Bartholomew of Pisa, Bernardin de Bustis, Pelbart de Temeswar, &c. &c. &c. What would Christians think of the impious Fable of *Salome* (we appeal to those who have read it), when she would satisfy herself of the Resurrection of the Virgin Mary, as related in the *Protoevangelium* (*asserted to be written by St. James!!*), were it to be published in their vulgar tongue?—Papists who are curious on this point we must refer to their priests—the tale is too gross for any persons but the clergy of that Church to repeat which could approve of their *writing* such Legends.

We close the subject of *miracles* by asking our Roman Catholic brethren, if their Church has not ever been most fruitful in her performance of them, when she had the least cause to be so; we mean, when in the height of her own power, in the very darkest ages of Christianity; and when a cruel death awaited the wretch who disputed it?—But when humbled to the earth—when her *Infallible* Pontiff obsequiously bowed his neck to his "dearest son in Christ," as he called Bonaparte, who had invaded his territory—by whom he was immured in a prison—*then*, when this "Church" sunk at the feet of him who thus had spurned her, *not one miracle* could she accomplish to save herself from despair! Is not this an evidence worth the consideration even of an

"*implicit,*" whose stake on the infallibility of his doctrine is his own immortal soul? Let Papists also recollect, that the miracles wrought by our Lord and his Apostles were to *effect great objects;* not one of which was performed for the mere purpose of astonishing or gratifying the vulgar.

Chap. IX.—Of Images.

What is your doctrine as to images?

We hold that the images or pictures of Christ, of his blessed Mother ever a Virgin, and of other saints, are to be had and retained; and that due honour and veneration is to be given them.

Do you not worship images?

No, by no means, if by *worship* you mean *divine honour;* for this we don't give to the highest angel or saint, nor even to the Virgin Mary, much less to images.

Do you not pray to images?

No, we don't: because, as both our catechism and common sense teach us, *They can neither see, nor hear nor help us.*—Doway Catechism.

Why then do you pray before an image or crucifix?

Because the sight of a good picture or image, for example, of Christ upon the cross, helps to enkindle devotion in our hearts towards him that has loved us to that excess, as to lay down his life for the love of us.

Are you taught to put your trust and confidence in images, as the heathens did in their idols; as if there were a certain virtue, power, or divinity residing in them?

No, we are expressly taught the contrary by the council of *Trent,* Session 25.

How do you prove that it is lawful to make or keep the images of Christ and his saints?

Because God himself commanded *Moses, Exod.* xxv. 18, 19, 20, 21, to make two cherubims of beaten gold, and place them at the two ends of the mercy-seat over the ark of the covenant in the very sanctuary. "And there," says he, ver. 22, "will I meet thee, and I will commune with thee from above the mercy-seat from between the two cherubims which are upon the ark of the testimony, of all things which I will give thee in commandment unto the children of Israel." God also commanded, *Numb.* xxi. 8, 9, a serpent of brass to be made, for the healing of those who were bit by the fiery serpents; which serpent was an emblem of Christ, *John* iii. 14, 15.

But is it not forbidden, Exod. xx. 4, "*to make the likeness of any thing in heaven above, or in the earth beneath, or in the waters under the earth?*"

It is forbidden "to make to ourselves" any such image or likeness; that is to say, to make it our god, or put our trust in it, and give it the honour which belongs to God: which is explained by the following words, "Thou shalt not bow down thyself to them," (that is, "thou shalt not adore them," for so both the *Septuagint* and *Vulgate* translate it) "nor serve them." Otherwise, if all likenesses were forbid by this commandment, we should be obliged to fling down our sign posts, and deface the king's coin.

What kind of honour do Catholics *give to the images* of Christ *and his saints?*

A relative honour.

What do you mean by a relative honour?

By a *relative honour*, I mean an honour which is given to a thing, not for any intrinsic excellence or dignity in the thing itself, but barely for the relation it has to something else; as when the courtiers bow to the chair of state, or *christians* to the name of *Jesus*, which is an image or remembrance of our Saviour to the ear, as the crucifix is to the eye.

Have you any instances of this relative honour allowed by Protestants?

Yes: in the honour they give to the name of Jesus, to their churches, to the altar, to the Bible, to the symbols of bread and wine in the sacrament. Such also was the honour which the *Jews* gave to the ark and cherubims, and which *Moses* and *Joshua* gave to the land on which they stood as being "holy ground," *Exod.* iii. 5. *Jos.* v. 15, &c.

How do you prove, that there is a relative honour *due to the images or pictures of Christ and his saints?*

From the dictates of common sense and reason, as well as of piety and religion, which teach us to express our love and esteem for the persons whom we honour, by setting a value upon all things that belong to them, or have any relation to them: thus a loyal subject, a dutiful child, a loving friend, value the pictures of their king, father, or friend; and those who make no scruple of abusing the image of Christ, would severely punish the man that would abuse the image of his king.

Does your church allow of images of God the Father, or of the blessed Trinity?

Our profession of faith makes no mention of such images as these: yet we don't think them unlawful, provided that they be not understood to bear any likeness or resemblance of the divinity, which cannot be expressed in colours, or represented by any human workmanship. For, as *protestants* make no difficulty of painting the Holy Ghost under the figure of a dove, because he appeared so when Christ

was baptized, *Matt.* iii. 16, so we make no difficulty of painting God the Father under the figure of a venerable old man, because he appeared in that manner to the prophet *Daniel* vii. 9.

A saving "*if*" is again summoned by the Pope to support his logical, or, *if* not, anything but scriptural, *reasonings;* however, the worship of, and praying to, images is positively *denied.* In the first place, we beg to ask any Romish Priest, what it is intended should be understood by *coram hac Imagine?* We *suppose* it to mean, *before this Image?* and in Papal consecrations of the images of their Saints, it is said, that the boon sought is to be obtained by the worship of the Saint addressed, in the above terms; and to which object the image is *blessed* and *sanctified.* Prayers are to be offered before particular images in particular places for particular purposes. Why otherwise are, or *were,* pilgrimages made to Loretto, &c., for the purpose of addressing an image, or praying before *that* image, when fifty similar statues stood silently upon their pedestals, *equally sensitive* as to the *degree* of "veneration" paid to them, at home?—The Pope, we think, need not have referred his admirers to the *Council of Trent* (at which he presided). Not one in a hundred of them know the "*Grounds of their Faith*" now before them, as he has written it for their edification; but if Papists are not "*as the heathens*" to trust in their images, "*as if there were a certain power or virtue*" in them, how is it to be understood that by consecration they become a *means of grace?* The idolatry of the heathen never led him to suppose that the image he bowed to was the *original* which it *represented*—the heathens were not so foolish as to imagine any such thing; they paid a "veneration" to, and worshipped before, *their* images; and when we see the Papists kneeling to, and kissing logs of wood and blocks of stone chiselled into particular shapes, in what other way can it be understood? The precise difference (if any exist) between a *Dedication* of the one, and a *Consecration* of the other, we do not think it of sufficient importance to inquire into.

When God told Moses to place the two Cherubim over the Ark, is it intended to imply that these were to be worshipped or venerated more than the table of Shittim-wood, the candlestick, or any other ornament or furniture it was to contain? Certainly not; this is one of the most lame of miserable excuses made by Popery for offering her devotions to stocks and stones, which are alone due to the Almighty God. We admit that the "Grounds of Faith" before us says, it is recorded in the 25th Session of the Council of Trent, that the doctrine of the Papist and the Pagan are different, as regards their image-worship. Without disputing this point, we must positively assert that we have witnessed, in Popish chapels, all the external signs of worship that humanity can evince, shown towards their statues;—we have seen them kissed, knelt to, embraced, wept over, and have heard them called "Blessed," &c. Nor shall we say more on this part of our subject, than *if this worship* (which we have often witnessed) was *not* from the heart—even towards a mistaken object—little can be said for the *sincerity* of the adorers. Sure we are that, if Romanists had read the Scriptures, many of the Pope's extracts had not been made—the Brazen Serpent, alluded to by Pius, is one of these. Christ says of himself, in the text referred to, that as Moses lifted up the serpent in the wilderness, even so must the son of man be lifted up. It is true that God commanded this Brazen Serpent to be made which He, in his mercy, appointed a *means of grace* for accomplishing miraculous cures to the penitent in the wilderness; but let us see how far these means of grace, appointed by God himself, will justify those things, impiously, we think, made, and so called by Popery. According to the Jewish chronology, the Brazen Serpent was made about A. M. 2552; but in the days of the good king Hezekiah, between 700 and 800 years afterwards, about A. M. 3294, the people paid it an *idolatrous* worship. The children of Israel did *burn incense* to it (2 Kings xviii. 4), when the king *broke it to pieces*, calling it—since the people had made it

their *idol—Nehushtan,* or a mere *piece of brass.* When will Popery act thus towards those things of her own making, to which *she* offers *incense?* As it is admitted that God commands we should not bow down to nor worship any graven image, &c., why are Roman Catholics taught to do so? "The King's coin" is too fervently worshipped by all the world, we must acknowledge; but we never heard of a *Protestant* worshipping "a sign-post." The "relative honour" spoken of, is obviously too often lost in the most *unequivocal worship,* and which it is calculated to induce, as every-day experience shows, in direct contradiction to the positive command of God*. Pius then quits the Scriptures for *his* "common sense and reason." Of these he is welcome to all the benefit they will afford him; and we will merely observe, that though the Protestant revere his lawful Sovereign, he would not be so absurd nor so wicked as to treat his effigy as a means of spiritual grace; neither would he "abuse the image of Christ," whilst he spurned the idea of prostrating himself in supplication to the wood, stone, or painted canvass, which represented the Original.

* As the "*relative* honour" spoken of by the Pope has a totally distinct and opposite meaning to that which Protestants understand by the expression, it will be more clearly appreciated by an extract from the Roman Missal, used at the present time. In the *adoration of the Cross* on a *Good Friday* (which is the chief part of the office of the day), the Priest unveils the curtain before it by solemn degrees, saying, *Ecce lignum crucis* (Behold the wood of the Cross); the clergy and people respond, *Venite adoremus* (Come, let us *adore*). This anthem being repeated twice more till the whole Cross is uncovered, the Priest lays it down in a proper place, and all kneeling thrice on both knees, *reverently approach to, and devoutly kiss the feet of the crucifix.* Then (after certain hymns) is the following anthem:—"*We* ADORE *thy* CROSS, O Lord, and we praise and glorify thy holy Resurrection; for, *by the* WOOD *of the* CROSS, *the whole earth is filled with joy!*" Such is the *relative* honour paid by Popery to her images, &c. which but for the above extract might not have been clearly understood by those who only pay their adoration to GOD. The above is also in the English Missals, and in defiance of "*We* ADORE *the* CROSS," &c. there is a note attached, which says, when Papists "kneel or prostrate themselves before a crucifix, it is Jesus Christ only whom they adore."—This *note* is certainly necessary, or otherwise the people must have supposed that which is in itself so explicit was really intended so to be understood. But if this *note* be admitted as the *real* meaning of the *adoration of the Cross,* what then becomes of the positive assertion *to the contrary* of that great Popish-made Saint, Thomas Aquinas, who says (3 *Par. Qu.* 2, *Art.* 4, *in Cor. Conclusio*), *Crux Christi est adoranda adaratione latriæ.* (The Cross of Christ *is* to be worshipped with *divine adoration*)—as the same angelic Doctor (so Papists call him) says of the *images,* &c. in the place quoted above.

The last paragraph is another of the Papal curiosities. It is, impiously, we must believe, admitted, that the *images* of GOD THE FATHER, or of the TRINITY, may be placed in Romish Churches, provided that these representations bear *no likeness to what they are intended to represent*, and "which *cannot be expressed in colours nor represented by any human workmanship!*" This is "*common sense* and *reason*" with a vengeance!—As the Holy Ghost appeared in the palpable form of a *Dove*, Protestants so depict him, as they do our Saviour in his humanity; but this will not excuse Popery for her representations of God, the Almighty Father, under the figure of an *old man*, in direct defiance of his express commands.

Deut. iv. 15. "Take good heed unto yourselves, for *ye saw no manner of similitude* [of God] in the day that the Lord spake unto you, lest ye corrupt yourselves, and make you a graven image, the similitude of any figure, the likeness of male or female," &c.

Isaiah xl. 18, 25. "To whom then will ye liken God, or what likeness will ye compare unto him. To whom then will ye liken me, or shall I be equal? saith the Holy One."

Habakkuk ii. 18, 19. "What profiteth the graven *image* that the maker thereof hath graven it—the molten image, and a teacher of lies, that the maker of his work trusteth therein, to make dumb idols? Woe unto him that saith to the *wood*, awake—to the dumb *stone*, arise, *it shall teach!* Behold, it is laid over with gold and silver, and there is no breath at all in the midst of it."

Acts xvii. 29. "Forasmuch then as we are the offspring of God, we ought not to think that the Godhead is like unto gold, or silver, or stone, graven by art, and man's device."

Rom. i. 23. "Professing themselves to be wise, they became fools, and changed the glory of the uncorruptible God into an image made like to corruptible man," &c.

These extracts are sufficient to prove, that, although Popery "makes no difficulty of painting God the Father under the figure of a venerable old man," it *would* be a more difficult task than she could accomplish to prove, *by the Scriptures*, it is not an act of idolatry forbidden by God, his Prophets, and Apostles. The Pope has, however, made a somewhat *desperate* attempt to do so in his reference to Daniel; to whom, he says, the Almighty appeared as a venerable *old man*. In speaking of his *vision*, the words of the Prophet (ch. vii. 9) are these: "I beheld till the thrones were cast down, and the ANCIENT OF DAYS did sit, whose garment was white as snow, and the hair of his head like the pure wool."—The Pope's false quotation from this vision is *all* that can be offered for the impiety of attempting to represent the Almighty God!—There is not one Papist, capable of understanding, who would risk his *life* by drawing the picture of his king, were it made treason to do so; yet how many risk their SOULS, if the Scriptures are to be relied upon, by affecting to portray the likeness of God, and casting aside His holy word for the legends, ordinances, and vain unscriptural doctrines of Popery!

The origin of image-worship commenced in, as Mosheim says, "a preposterous desire of imitating the *Pagan* rites, and of blending them with the *Christian* worship, and that idle propensity which the generality of mankind have towards *a gaudy and ostentatious religion;*"—and "many imagined that this worship *drew down into the images the propitious presence of the saints or celestial beings they represented.*" Platina says, that in the fifth century, Pope Sixtus III. prevailed on the Emperor Valentinian to place upon the altar of St. Peter a golden image of our Saviour, enriched with jewels. Gregory I. permitted them in churches, but condemned their worship; in the two succeeding ages, they were set up or thrown down, according to the caprice of the reigning infallibility, when (A. D. 712) Pope Constantine decreed that there

should be great adoration paid to them, in opposition to the Emperor Phillipicus, who had ordered them to be removed from the churches, and whom this Pontiff caused to be condemned and excommunicated as an apostate to *true* religion—a revolution followed, and the Emperor lost his crown. Similar disputes and results were carried on between the Greeks and Latins. Leo, the Isaurian, prohibited image-worship in 726, Pope Gregory II. enforced it; and thus tumult, excommunication, and the sword, settled these disputes, whilst some of the most learned of the Prelates wrote with all their force against the idolatrous worship which the most violent of the Popes maintained: hence, in the ninth century, through the exertions of Claudius, Bishop of Turin, that city and its neighbourhood "was less infected with superstition than the other parts of Europe." Disputes on this subject continued until the eleventh century respecting images which, however, *all* parties of those who worshipped them agreed in declaring to possess wonderful *miraculous* powers. In the golden age of Popery (which was the iron age of ignorance, as some of her own writers have been compelled to admit, but which those of the present day would fain deny)—the images, crosses, &c. chatted familiarly with their favourites:—one crucifix approved of the writings of Thomas; a second addressed Bridget; a third conferred (in Latin) with Bernard; a fourth talked to Francis, *saying*, "Go, and build up my house;" a fifth to Dunstan (deciding in favour of his argument that the Priests should not marry), &c. &c. &c. Images of stone, brass, &c. have been (quite) as eloquent as others of wood; but as we do not now *often* hear of their verbal communications *in England*, and thinking it would be a loss of time to repeat what they *used* to say, we will conclude with Father Crasset's opinion of their claims to regard:—"God hath in every age, and still continues to work innumerable miracles by the *images* of Saints, and especially by those of the Virgin."

CHAP. X.—OF INDULGENCES.

What do you mean by Indulgences?

Not leave to commit sin, or pardon for sins to come: but only a releasing, by the power of the keys committed to the Church, the debt of temporal punishment, which may remain due upon account of our sins, after the sins themselves, as to the guilt and eternal punishment, have been already remitted by repentance and confession.

Can you prove from scripture, that there is a punishment often due upon account of our sins, after the sins themselves have been remitted?

Yes, this evidently appears in the case of King *David*, 2 *Sam.* xii. where, although the prophet *Nathan*, upon his repentance, tells him, ver. 13, "The Lord hath put away thy sin," yet he denounces unto him many terrible punishments, ver. 10, 11, 12, 14, which should be inflicted by reason of this sin, which accordingly afterwards ensued.

What is the faith of your Church touching Indulgences?

It is comprised in these words of our profession of faith: *I affirm that the power of indulgences was left by Christ in the Church, and that the use of them is most wholesome to* christian *people.*

Upon what scripture do you ground this?

The power of granting indulgences was left by Christ to the Church; *Matt.* xvi. 19, "I will give unto thee the keys of the kingdom of heaven: and whatsoever thou shalt bind on earth, shall be bound in heaven; and whatsoever thou shalt loose on earth, shall be loosed in heaven." And we have an instance in Scripture of St. *Paul's* granting an indulgence to the *Corinthian* whom he had put under penance for incest: 2 *Cor.* ii. 10, "to whom ye forgive any thing" (he speaks of the incestuous sinner whom he had desired them not to receive), "I forgive also; for if I forgive anything, to whom I forgave it, for your sakes forgave I it in the person of Christ:" that is, by the power and authority received from him.

"What do you mean by Indulgences?" is a very plain question; but before we are enlightened upon this "*mystery*," we are first informed what (as it is asserted) it does *not* mean—a somewhat peculiar method of Popish *reasoning*. However, these indulgences are, if we properly comprehend the intent of the invention, a sort of ready-reckoners, framed for the purpose of striking a balance in the punishments due to those who keep running accounts of crime with the men who assert that they alone possess the power of giving a receipt in full to Sin, whatever be the amount of her iniquity.

Whenever Popery declares that anything "*evidently* appears" in the Scriptures, so sure is she to be most tenderly cautious in her quotations and references (as in the present case)—even as though she felt it might not be quite convenient so to prove the various and innumerable assertions she has made. From the "*evident*" proofs of the comfortable doctrine of indulgences*, in which she commands her adherents to believe, she has modestly selected but *one line* of the Old Testament, and referred to the *preceding* verses, and the succeeding one (the 14th.) Had the Pope *quoted* the latter instead of referring to it merely, it would have shown *wherefore* David was to be punished by the Almighty, *although* he had "put away his sin." The judgment denounced upon him by Nathan was to afford a signal proof to the Heathens that the offence of which he had been

---

* Mr. Townsend, in his Accusations of History, says, "The *prices of the pardons* of offences were demanded *according to the supposed gradations in the guilt* of the criminal. They were paid, therefore, as fines, on the same principle as in the common law of England a lesser sum is demanded by the magistrate for prophane swearing, and a larger sum for seduction, or defrauding the revenue, neither of which sums are required as fees of office." Mr. T. refers to Baron Maseres and Dr. Hales for the *List of Prices of the Dispensations;* also to "the *Table of the Impositions* (prices of pardons for sin) *of the Chancery of Rome*, published by Antony Egane, the Confessor-General of Ireland, after his conversion to Protestantism." By this we learn that the pardon of a *heretic* was rather *dear*, as the crime was heavy, amounting to no less than 36*l.* 9*s.*—*Venial, or slight offences* were, however, pardoned at a proportionately reasonable rate;—thus a man who married a second wife—*after murdering the first!*—washed his hands of the blood in the *holy* water of Popery at the small charge of 8*l.* 2*s.* 9*d.*! "Protestants," says Mr. T., "either do not know, or they cannot believe even the *possibility*, much more the *certainty*, of the crimes of which your Church has been guilty."—*See Tenth Letter to Mr. Charles Butler.*

We quote the following "most wholesome" comforts, as the Pope says, "to *Christian* people," as being of a later date than those noticed above:—"In the year 1800, a Spanish ship from Europe, was captured near the coast of South America, by Admiral Harvey, then Captain of the Southampton frigate. There were on board large bales of paper, valued in her books at 7500*l.* It was a matter of surprise to him to see them rated so highly, and to hear the master of the captured vessel speak of them with great admiration. He examined them, and found them all filled with large sheets of paper, printed some in Spanish and some in Latin, but all sealed with the seals of the Ecclesiastical Court of Spain, or at Rome. These were *Indulgences*, or pardons, for various sins mentioned in the (Roman) Catholic Rubric, and the price, which varied from half a dollar to seven dollars, was marked upon each. They had been *bought* in Spain, and were *intended for sale* in South America. At Tortola, some Dutch merchants bought the whole for 200*l.*, with the hope of being able to *smuggle* them among the Spaniards in America (*a*)."

(*a*) These comfortable things for "*Christian* people" were to be had with blanks to be filled up by the names of the purchasers.

guilty was an abomination in the sight of God.—*Howbeit, because by this deed* (said the Prophet, Nathan) *thou hast given great occasion to the enemies of the Lord to blaspheme,* the child also that is born unto thee shall surely die.—Does not Popery blaspheme in referring to this text as a warranty of her indulgences?—"The power of granting Indulgences," we are informed, is claimed by Popery, by virtue, as she says, of holding the keys of heaven (it is to be hoped she will be able to use them *on her own account?*)—and as this is her vain excuse for whatever sins she commits on earth, it would have saved both herself and us much trouble if she had relied *solely* upon this power, without further *argument,* for enforcing upon mankind whatever doctrines pleased her best. Christ addressed *all* his disciples when he asked, whom say *ye* that I am?—and of whom Peter replied to the question: but as the keys of heaven were then *promised,* the promise of our Lord was *fulfilled* when he confirmed his vicarious power to his Apostles *jointly* (John xx. 23). The text above (of the "*keys*"), though quoted before, must be *again* repeated; for Popery well knows it is only by persuading mankind that *she* can open the gates of heaven when and to whom she pleases, that can induce *them* to submit themselves to her dominion. *Her* keys are, and ever were, employed *in locking up* the *minds* of her disciples, lest they should, in the language of the Apostle, serve God with a *zeal according to knowledge.* We are next told of St. Paul *granting an indulgence* (why not have said St. *Peter?*) to a Corinthian whom he had *put under penance.* As a falsehood cannot be a *fact,* neither can invective be argument;—we will not, therefore, call the above assertion the *most* shameless falsehood Popery has made, shocking as it is to see the word of God corrupted to establish every lie put forth by an anti-christian spirit—deeply as it *ought to be felt by every individual professing the hope of salvation through the* REDEEMER *of the world!*

We seek not by argument to persuade, but by the most

positive evidences of Scripture to *convince*. The 10th verse of the Epistle to the Corinthians, quoted by the Pope, is preceded by these :—" But if any have caused grief, he hath not grieved me, but in part, that I may not overcharge you all. Sufficient to such a man is this punishment which was *inflicted of many;* so that, contrarywise, *ye ought* rather to forgive him and comfort him, lest, perhaps, such a one should be swallowed up with overmuch sorrow; wherefore, *I beseech* you, that you would *confirm your love towards him;* for to this end did I write, that I might know the proof of you, whether ye be obedient in all things." —Is there any Christian who reads the Scriptures who dare deny that this exhortation of St. Paul is to prevail on the Corinthians themselves to forgive their offending brother?—The person alluded to had sinned with his step-mother (1 Cor. v.); and, as we have shown what Popery has been pleased to call an *indulgence* for sin, we will now see the *penance* inflicted on the culprit *by St. Paul.* In the first place, be it observed, that St. Paul *neither saw him nor named him;* but (ch. v. 1.) tells the Corinthians that *it is reported* that the occurrence, as above, had taken place; and that (ver. 10, 11, 12), although they could not upon all occasions shun evil persons whilst in this world, yet not to keep company with any man called a brother who was guilty—and *this* is the *penance inflicted by St. Paul!*—The Pope has forgotten to tell us to whom the sinner's *confession* was made, since *without* confession it is said that there can be no remission, and, consequently, no *indulgence* can be granted?—To what wretchedly impious tergiversations are those reduced in supporting the falsehoods of Popery, whilst the celestial light of the Gospel shines with full lustre upon the whole Christian world!—Mark the following verses of the above chapter (which we have quoted in the early part of this work), and with which it concludes!—Let any Roman Catholic, capable of even reading them, apply them to the *infliction of a penance if he can:*—v. 12, 13, " For

what have *I* to do to *judge them also that are without?* Do not ye judge them that are within; but them that are without God judgeth."

The origin of Indulgences commenced in the twelfth century*, for the purpose of filling the coffers of the Popish clergy at the expense of a deluded multitude; for "*all the various ranks and orders of the clergy had each their peculiar method of fleecing the people.*" The Bishops commenced the traffic in Indulgences; whilst the Monks and Abbots, who were not *qualified* to grant them, "*carried about carcasses and relics of their Saints,* which the million were allowed to *look at, touch,* or *hug, at stated prices;* and who thus often gained as much by this raree-show, as the Bishops did by their indulgences." When the Popes saw the business to be done in this way, they limited the power of their Bishops, and engrossed the whole trade to themselves, making "the Court of Rome the general magazine of Indulgences;" and, at length, they "not only remitted the penalties which the *Civil and Ecclesiastical Laws* had enacted against transgressors, but audaciously usurped the authority which belongs to God alone, and impiously pretended to abolish even the punishments which are reserved in a future state for the workers of iniquity:—a step, this, which the Bishops, with all their avarice and presumption, had never once ventured to take."—"The *penitentials* † were now suppressed, by which a loose rein was given to every description of vice." In the following century, "to justify these scandalous measures of the Pontiffs, a most monstrous and absurd doctrine was now invented, supported by Thomas, a Papal Saint, and which contained the following enormities‡:—

* The whole account of these Indulgences is quoted from Mosheim.

† Books in which were registered the penances considered to be *due* to each crime respectively.

‡ John Tetzel, the Dominican, was chosen by Albert, Archbishop of Mentz, for his uncommon impudence, to preach and proclaim those famous Indulgences of Leo. X.,

"That there actually existed an *immense treasure* of *merit*, composed of *pious deeds and virtuous actions*, which the Saints had performed *beyond what was necessary for their own salvation*, and which were, therefore, *applicable to the benefit of others;* that the guardian and dispenser of this precious treasure was the *Roman Pontiff;* and that, of consequence, he was empowered to assign, *to such as he thought proper*, a portion of this inexhaustible source of merit, suitable to their respective guilt, and *sufficient to deliver them from the punishment due to their crimes!*" It is a most deplorable mark of the power of superstition, says Mosheim, that a doctrine so absurd in its nature, and so pernicious in its defects, should yet be defended in the Church of Rome*.

At the conclusion of the thirteenth century, Boniface VIII. introduced the *Jubilee*, as it is called, to the other rites of the Romish Church. He issued a mandate, enjoining all Papists to confess their sins, &c., visit the churches of SS. Peter and Paul at Rome, by which, he asserted, a plenary remission of all sins and offences were to be obtained; and that this jubilee should take place every hundred years.

The first festival, however, of this sort proved that it was not a bad speculation, since the city of Rome was filled with the most wealthy visitors from all parts, so that *fifty* years after the first jubilee, Clement VI. enacted that it should take place *every fifty* years. This period was, however, of too long a date where so rich a harvest was to be obtained by merely a few Indulgences for sin to be disposed of by those who declared they had the power of granting them; and Urban VI. lowered the term for dispensing them to *twenty-five years*. We cannot step out of our course to state the

---

which administered the remission of all sins, *past, present, and to come*, however enormous their nature, to those who were *rich enough to purchase them*. Mosh. ut supra.

* The second section of the Bull of Leo XII., 1825, says—"The year of universal jubilee, when the *infinite treasure* of the *precious merits* of our Saviour and *his saints*, which the divine mercy had intrusted to our dispensation . . . . so long kept shut, was again, *through our feeble ministry*, to be laid open," &c.

particulars of the ceremonial part of the business of the processions—of the Pope knocking at the church door with a golden hammer, &c. But we shall state the following fact as we received it from a Priest at Rome, during the last Jubilee in 1825,—nor is it unworthy of remark. The inhabitants of Rome, to "gain the Jubilee," as it is called, were to visit St. Peter's and other churches for *thirty* days; but, as an encouragement to the stranger (who, of course, brought cash with him), his penance, duty, or whatever else it may be called, was to make these visits but for *fifteen* days. We will now give a few brief extracts from the mandate of the Vatican, entitled, "The Bull of his *Holiness*, Leo XII., extending the Universal Jubilee, celebrated at Rome, A.D. 1825, to the whole (Roman) Catholic world."

In the 10th section, the Pope says—"This year, therefore, has *truly* been a year of salvation, not alone to the inhabitants of this city, but to the many foreigners who performed this pious pilgrimage, and who, on their return to their homes, can attest the truth of what we here record. They have more than once had to admire the *wonderful effects* of Christian charity, ... that *true* charity which is *nowhere found but in the* (*Roman*) *Catholic Church!* .... They will not only have to recount, on their return, how the weak and tottering were *confirmed in virtue*, the *sick restored to health*," &c. "but they will also prove that they themselves are *renewed* in the *spirit of their mind*," &c. By the 12th section, we learn in what this *spirit of charity* consists:—After *claiming the supreme power of binding and loosing*, and stating the number of visits to be made to the churches, the Pontiff says, his *subjects* * are to pour out their supplications

* Addressing his clergy, the Pope (*Sec.* 21, 22) says, "Take up, venerable Brothers, take up the shield of faith, &c.—*Doubt not that all* (*Roman*) *Catholic kings and princes, our dearest children in Christ, will favour you.*—They know that it is written, there is no power but from God; and again, 'by ME *kings reign, and lawgivers decree just things.*' 'By ME *princes rule, and the mighty decree justice!!!*'"

to God for the *exaltation* of holy Mother Church, and the *extirpation of heretics* !* (*Pro sanctæ matris ecclesiæ exaltatione hæresum extirpatione*)—Protestants, we fear, would be but ill off, had Popery the *power* of INDULGING herself to the extent of her wishes. To this Bull is attached a "*Supplement from the Audience of the Most Holy Father*, given on the 8th of January, 1826," wherein it is said, that in those countries where *heresy and infidelity* prevail (that is, all professing the Christian faith, Papists alone excepted), and there are no churches, the Pope, "in his benignity and wisdom," provides other means for his followers to obtain a "participation in the *salutary treasure* of the Jubilee—*provided always*"—that the *pious* prayer as cited above be fervently offered!

CHAP. XI.—OF THE SUPREMACY OF ST. PETER AND HIS SUCCESSORS.

What is the Catholic *doctrine as to the Pope's supremacy?*

It is comprised in these two articles:—1. That St. *Peter* by divine commission was head of the Church of Christ. 2. That the Pope, or Bishop of *Rome*, as successor to St. *Peter*, is at present head of the Church, and Christ's Vicar upon earth.

How do you prove St. Peter's *supremacy?*

First, From the very name of *Peter*, or *Cephas*, which signifies a *rock*, which name our Lord, who does nothing without reason, gave to him, who before was called *Simon*, to signify that he should be *as the rock* or *foundation* upon which he would build his church. According to what he himself declared, *Matt.* xvi. 18, when he told him, "Thou art *Peter*," (that is, *a rock*) "and upon THIS ROCK will I build my church, and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it."

2dly, From the following words, *Matt.* xvi. 19, "I will give unto thee the keys of the kingdom of heaven, and whatsoever thou shalt

---

* The English version of this passage, as published by the Roman Catholic booksellers in London is very differently expressed;—perhaps Popery, *in England*, deemed it prudent to make some little alteration.—The words run thus:—"IV. The fourth condition required for gaining the Jubilee, is the visiting of *certain churches* appointed by the Bishop, for fifteen days, and there devoutly offering up their prayers for the *intentions prescribed by his Holiness; viz.* for the *exaltation* of the *holy* (*Roman*) *Catholic* Church *throughout the world*;—for *bringing back all straying souls in the ways of unity and truth*," &c. How Priests can thus render it we know not—let them prove their translation correct, and we will admit that their *miracle*-days are not yet past.

bind on earth, shall be bound in heaven; and whatsoever thou shalt loose on earth, shall be loosed in heaven." Where, under the figure of "the keys of the kingdom of heaven," our Lord ensureth to *Peter* the chief authority in his Church; as when a king gives to one of his officers the keys of a city, he thereby declares that he makes him governor of that city.

3dly, From *Luke* xii. 31, 32, "The Lord said, *Simon, Simon,* behold Satan hath desired to have you, that he may sift you as wheat. But I have prayed for thee, that thy faith fail not, and when thou art converted strengthen thy brethren." In which text our Lord not only declared his particular concern for *Peter,* in praying for him that his faith might not fail; but also committed to him the care of his brethren the other apostles, in charging him to confirm or strengthen them.

4thly, From *John* xxi. 15, &c. "*Jesus* said to *Simon Peter, Simon* son of *Jonas,* lovest thou me more than these? He saith unto him, Yea, Lord, thou knowest that I love thee. He saith unto him, FEED MY LAMBS. He saith to him again the second time, *Simon,* son of *Jonas,* lovest thou me? He saith unto him, Yea, Lord, thou knowest that I love thee. He saith unto him, FEED MY SHEEP. He saith unto him the third time, *Simon,* son of *Jonas,* lovest thou me? *Peter* was grieved, because he said unto him the third time, lovest thou me? And he said unto him, Lord, thou knowest all things, thou knowest that I love thee. *Jesus* saith unto him, FEED MY SHEEP." In which texts our Lord, in a most solemn manner, thrice committed to *Peter* the care of his whole flock, of all his sheep without exception, that is, of his whole Church.

How do you prove, that this commission given to Peter *descends to the Pope or Bishop of* Rome?

Because, by the unanimous consent of the Fathers, and the tradition of the Church in all ages, the Bishops of *Rome* are the successors of St. *Peter,* who translated his chair from *Antioch* to *Rome,* and died Bishop of *Rome.* Hence the See of *Rome,* in all ages, is called *The See of* Peter, *the Chair of* Peter, and absolutely the *See Apostolic:* and in that quality has from the beginning exercised jurisdiction over all other Churches, as appears from the best records of ancient history.

Besides, supposing the supremacy of St. *Peter,* which we have proved above from plain Scripture; it must consequently be allowed that this supremacy which Christ established for the better government of his Church, and maintaining of unity; was not to die with *Peter,* no more than the Church, which he promised should stand for ever. For how can any *christian* imagine, that Christ should appoint a head for the government of his Church, and maintaining of unity during the apostles' time; and design another government for succeeding ages, when there was like to be so much more need of a head. Therefore we must grant that St. *Peter's* supremacy was by

succession to descend to somebody. Now, I would willingly know, who has half so fair a title to this succession as the Bishop of *Rome?*

Why do you call the Roman *church* the Mother and Mistress of all Churches?

Because, as we have already seen, her bishop is St. *Peter's* successor, and Christ's vicar upon earth; and, consequently, the father and pastor of all the faithful: and therefore the Church, as being St. *Peter's* See, is the mother of all churches.

That the supremacy of the Pope is the doctrine of *Popery*, we readily admit; but that it is opposed to CHRISTIANITY we are about to add further proof. Christ called Simon *Cephas*, but the Pope *might* have thought it a task of supererogation to have informed the world that its Redeemer "*does nothing without reason;*" yet this undisputed fact among Christians is *no* reason why his divine expressions should be tortured by interested and ambitious men, into meanings which the whole object of his human life most unequivocally shows they were never intended to convey. When our Saviour said to Peter, "Upon *this* rock I will build my Church," Popery would have it understood, that its whole weight was to rest upon the shoulders of St. Peter; yet, as we have already shown, in the *same* chapter, Christ, on another occasion, tells him he was an *offence* to him as savouring too much of the things of men. The rock on which he said he *would* build his Church, *is* the rock whereon it still rests, and is so firmly established that "the gates of hell shall not prevail against it"—*The* ROCK OF FAITH—the *faith* which the Apostles evinced when Peter answered for them ALL, "Thou art the Christ, the son of the living God." If Roman Catholics doubt this, let them read the whole chapter referred to, where they will find that (ver. 13) when Jesus came into the coasts of Cesarea Philippi, he asked—not Peter only, but *all*—his *disciples*, saying, "Whom do men say that I, the son of man, am?"—To this question they replied variously, as they had heard different presons assert their belief (ver. 14), "And *they* said, *some* say that thou art John the Baptist, *some* Elias, and *others* Jeremiah, or *one of the Prophets.*" Thus each of the disciples

related the reports he had heard; and when (ver. 15) Christ said unto *them*, "But whom say *ye* that I am?"—we appeal to common sense, and every-day experience, if any twelve men, of the same opinion, were to be asked a question by their king or director on a subject upon which they were most unanimously agreed, if all the twelve would answer *at once*, or one of them reply in the name of the rest? It was Peter who answered, and Christ blessed him; by which he was saved; since, when Judas had betrayed his Lord, and all the other Apostles forsook him (Matt. xxvi. 56, 72, 74), Peter it was who not only *denied* his divine master, but who also *forswore* him. The promise of Christ, "I *will* give unto thee the keys," &c. was (as we suppose it will be admitted) perfected, when he *did* give them; and, if so, to whom was it, we ask, were they confided—to the peculiar custody of Peter? No such thing; we learn the direct contrary in the text referred to (John xx.) in this very chapter, wherein we are informed by "the disciple whom Jesus loved," that it was to *eleven* of the Apostles (Thomas Didymus not being then present) that the *power* of remitting sins *was given*. Our Saviour did not say, as on the former occasion to Peter, "I *will* give thee," &c., but—"*Receive* ye the Holy Ghost; whosesoever sins *ye* remit, *they are remitted*," &c. We think the Pope somewhat too hasty in his simile of a king giving *one* of his officers the keys of a city; he should first have shown that Peter had *been that individual officer* who had been invested with the *particular charge* of it. We are now merely showing the unwarrantable construction which Popery, for her own worldly purposes, has put upon the text before us; we will show presently that such a supremacy as she would attach to St. Peter is *expressly forbidden* by Christ, and actually *written against* by St. Peter himself.

"3dly, from Luke xii." it is said—(the extract given is from chap. xxii.; and although these "Grounds of Faith" are not generally perused, yet Dr. Challoner should have paid a

little more attention to correctness, even though he might deny his own flock the opportunity of detecting their errors)—"3dly, From Luke," &c. is a *curious* proof of supremacy, as stated by the Pope. Peter, at the time alluded to, being the *most weak in faith* of the eleven, the Lord prayed that his faith might not fail; and bade him, *when he was converted*, to strengthen his brethren. Yet the Pope's version of our Saviour's expressions is, that they implied that the *whole charge of the brethren* was to be committed to Peter! Did the Pope and Doctor imagine, that Christ did not know that the faith of Peter's brethren was stronger than his own? The conversation took place, when Peter confidently said, *Lord, I am ready to go with thee both into prison and to death;* and when Jesus told him, he would thrice deny him! Such are Popish *arguments!*

When our Lord thrice asked Peter if he loved him, and the latter averred that he did, each time he was told (to *prove* the love he professed) to feed the flock of his master. "In which texts," says Pius, "*our Lord, in a most solemn manner, thrice committed to Peter* THE CARE *of* HIS WHOLE FLOCK, *of* ALL *his sheep,* WITHOUT EXCEPTION, that is, OF HIS WHOLE CHURCH!" Without wasting a second observation upon so palpable a misinterpretation of so plain a text, we will merely observe, that the Pope's flock must be sheepish indeed, who reject the Gospel for *his* interpretations of it.

Popery having, in her own way, endeavoured to establish the supremacy of St. Peter, next insists upon her own. Here, however, she, of course, is left without a scriptural *line* to support herself, yet stands, unabashed in all the nakedness of her own deformity! We have usually given her the full benefit of all the merits she has attributed to herself where she could not find any texts of Scripture to misapply to her purposes; and upon these occasions (as in the present instance) it cannot be denied that she always finds the most to say. We will bestow a passing word or two upon her

remarks on her own supremacy, and then adduce our proofs of its fallaciousness. First her "unanimous consent of the Fathers" is erroneous: *who*, of the Fathers, "*consented*" to any such thing as *Papal supremacy, until* Boniface III. (as we have already related) engaged Phocas to murder the Emperor Mauritius, and to confer the title of œcumenical Bishop (or Bishop of all the world!) upon himself, in the seventh century? We could fill our pages with the names of ancient Fathers (did we not rely upon the Scriptures alone for our proofs of Christianity) who, when the invention of supremacy first commenced, wrote *against* it*. *Who* of the Christian writers are to be preferred to the inspired Apostles and Evangelists? But as Popery is opposed to their benign tenets, she naturally turns to those of her "Fathers" who supported her Antichristian pretensions *after* she had made herself *supreme*. "The See of Peter" is *not* the language "of all ages;" but men who allow themselves, in the canons of their church, to be called *our Lord God the Pope*—(*Dominus noster Deus papa—Coun. of Lat. Sess.* 4) †, would not surely be very punctilious in calling anything else by whatever name they chose!

The Pope then proceeds, as he says, "*supposing* the supremacy of St. Peter," and asks, "how can any *Christian* imagine that Christ" should make such an appointment, and design another establishment of his Church; concluding with a "*therefore* we *must* grant that St. Peter's supremacy was, by succession, to descend to *somebody;*" and winds up his *proofs* and *arguments* by declaring that none has so good a title to it as himself—the Bishop of Rome.

Those Christians who read and believe the Gospel of Christ, do *not* "suppose" the supremacy of St. Peter, nor that our

* "We find," says Mosheim, "*in the most authentic accounts* of the transactions of this century, that not only *Emperors* and *Princes*, but also *whole nations* opposed the ambitious views of the *Bishops* of Rome."

† The fourth is called the great Council of Lateran, or the true *General* Council. Bellarmin (*de Concil.* I. i. c. 6.) gives a list of these *General* Councils, which are to be *rejected*.—*Concilia Generalia reprobata*, &c.

Saviour ever made such an appointment, because such tenets are opposed to his Gospel. The "*title*" of Popery was first established in blood, and afterwards maintained by the sword, until, disgusted with her crimes, her very myrmidons forsook her, and she became too powerless to wield it. As to what Popery says of her own being the *Mother* Church, we have already shown from the Scriptures that the Gospel was *first* planted by Christ himself at Jerusalem; and that his disciples were *first* called Christians at Antioch.—(p. 45).

Turning from Popery to the doctrines of our Saviour, we always find HIM speaking of the acts of HIS Ministers as *guiding*, *feeding*, *entreating*, and *exhorting;* but never of their *reigning*, *appointing*, *commanding*, and *damning*. He set them the example against becoming judges in the temporal inheritances of this world, when the man besought him to divide the property between him and his brother, but to whom Christ replied (Luke xii. 14.), "Man, who made me a judge or a divider over you?"—That his kingdom is wholly *spiritual*, he himself declares (John xviii.), "My kingdom is not of this world—if my kingdom were of this world, then would my servants fight," &c. In short, from the commencement of his preaching, until the hour of his crucifixion, he condemned the lust of worldly possessions, whilst he taught the never-failing treasures of heavenly grace, humility, patience, and universal charity. Popery herself will not dare (publicly *) to deny the truth of his assertion;—and as the precepts of Jesus were enforced by the words and acts of his Apostles, the *supremacy* of any one of them above the others is not quite so clear a fact as Pius has declared it to be. The Apostle, distinguished as the most beloved of his divine Master, was St. John (John xiii. 23).

When the Apostolic council was held at Jerusalem

* It is recorded of Leo X. and his most intimate companions in debauchery and infidelity, that he one day *jocularly* remarked to Cardinal Bembo, "*The Fable of Jesus Christ hath done us good service!*" Mosheim says, "He was remarkable for his prodigality, luxury, and imprudence; and has even been charged with *impiety, if not Atheism!*" It was this Pope who *excommunicated* Luther.

(Acts xv.), did St. Peter, as head of the Church, or the "prince of the Apostles," decide the controversy?—Did he open the debate, or did he close it?—No such things; but (ver. 7) *when there had been much disputing*, Peter rose up, &c. He was followed (ver. 12) by Barnabas and Paul, to whom St. James (Bishop of Jerusalem) succeeded, and who decided the controversy in these words (ver. 19), *Wherefore my sentence is*, &c. Did St. Peter dispute this authority? No:—the decree of the council was drawn up (ver. 29) in the very words of St. James.

Does St. Peter say, or does any other of the inspired penmen, that—to warrant the positive assertion of Pius—the care of the Christian Church was committed to him? (St. Peter).—No; but St. Paul says, when speaking of what he has suffered (2 Cor. xi. 28), he has, in addition to his bodily anxiety,—"that which cometh upon me daily, *the* CARE OF ALL THE CHURCHES." Did St. Peter possess greater influence, or evince more zeal in the conversion of the Jews (he being the Apostle of the circumcision, as was St. Paul of the Gentiles, (Gal. ii. 7, 8) than did St. Paul with the heathens? No; Paul (1 Cor. xv. 10) *laboured more abundantly* than all the Apostles; and, without even naming Peter, such commands as he gave to the Corinthians (1 Cor. vii. 17), "So," says he, "ORDAIN I IN ALL CHURCHES."

But let us now see what Peter says of himself—will Roman Catholics, we ask, believe the Pope in *preference* to St. Peter? We should hope they will not; and if so, the impious affectation of *Papal supremacy* must, at once, sink before the unequivocal declarations of Christ and his Apostles.—(1 Pet. i. 2, 3), "The elders which are among you I exhort, *who am* ALSO AN ELDER.—Feed the flock of God which is among you, taking the oversight thereof, *not by constraint*, but *willingly; not for filthy lucre*, but *of a ready mind*. Neither as being LORDS OVER GOD'S HERITAGE, but being *ensamples to the* FLOCK." Such are the expressions of St. Peter as to his office, and the "charge" he gives to his fellow-

labourers! Could he who declared himself "also" upon an *equality* with those who were *equals* have been their "PRINCE?" We shall see who call themselves *lords over God's heritage*, presently.

But we would first ask our Roman Catholic brethren, if they believe that the history of the reign of any king could be written without alluding to his coronation, the treaties he had entered into with Foreign Powers, his calling together and dissolving Parliaments, their Bills which he had signed, or, in short, without specifying one regal act during the whole period he had filled the throne?—Could any book be called a history of the reign of his Majesty, George IV. wherein these and similar acts of sovereignty were omitted? If the fact that *it could not* be allowed, how, we ask, with the *History of the Acts of the Apostles* before us, wherein we learn *all* that Peter did after the Resurrection of Christ,—how is it, if he were *supreme*, that, instead of appointing, he was appointed, (a messenger to Samaria with John, Acts viii. 14), instead of commanding, he was *withstood to the face* by Paul (Gal. ii. 11); that, if he were ever at Rome at all, we have no account of it, as of his journeys to the other places he visited; and that, instead of affording any information as to the ecclesiastical management of the Church of Rome to those who declare themselves his *heirs* and *successors*, the only Church from which he sends even a greeting—not to the Romans, but "To the strangers scattered throughout Pontus, Galatia, Cappadocia, Asia, and Bithynia" (1 Pet. i. 1)—is the Church at Babylon? (1 Pet. v. 13). But, above all, when (Luke xxii. 24) there was a strife amongst the Apostles, as to *which of them* SHOULD *be accounted the greatest*, will not Papists admit that the decree of OUR SAVIOUR ought to have decided the question for ever? Hear what HE said (ver. 25—31), "The kings of the Gentiles exercise lordship over them, &c.; but *ye shall not be so;* but he that IS greatest among you, let *him* be as the younger; and he that IS chief, as he that doth serve. For whether is greater, he that sitteth at

meat or he that serveth, *is* not he that sitteth at meat? but I am among you, *as he that serveth*—*Ye* are *they* which have continued with me in my temptations, and I appoint unto you a kingdom, as my Father hath appointed unto me, that *ye* may eat and drink at my table *in my kingdom*, and sit on thrones judging the twelve tribes of Israel." And now we appeal to the common sense of every Roman Catholic capable of reading the chapter from which the above extract is taken, if our Saviour could have more explicitly and practically shown them that HE *alone* was *great* among them—that they *should not have any lordship* over each other, and that the *greatness* to which he taught them to aspire was *humility?* What of *supremacy* among them can be extracted from these *positive commands* to the *contrary?* Peter's *confidence in himself*, and the *weakness of his faith, previous to the resurrection* of our Lord, was frequently evinced, and checked by his Master (Matt. xiv. 28—32, John xiii. 8, &c.); and in this very dispute (*for greatness*) it was that Peter (as the chief aspirant to the superiority contended for) was particularly addressed by Christ, who thus continued his discourse (ver. 31)—"Simon, Simon, *Satan hath desired to have you*," &c. Yet, is the very prayer of Christ for his *conversion* sought to be tortured by Popery into a *proof* that he was to be the "*Prince* of the Apostles"! —Let Papists, we again repeat it, "Search the Scriptures," that they may themselves judge of the accuracy and fairness of the positive proofs we advance; and by which they may feel somewhat surprised to learn that the oft-repeated sentence, "Thou art Peter, and upon this rock will I build my Church," &c. was so clearly understood by *all* the Apostles as the *rock of* THEIR *faith*, that neither Mark, Luke, nor John, *make the least allusion* to its particular application to Peter.

Is this circumstance, we ask, of no weight? That the inspired companions of Christ who have transmitted his doctrines as the inerrant guide to humanity should not have

thought it of sufficient importance to *allude* to an event upon which the salvation of so many thousand souls was to depend, if Christ himself could have intended them—(contrary to his explicit commands and declarations which we have quoted above)—to suppose that St. Peter was to be their "*Prince*," or to have any authority whatsoever over them?

St. Mark says (ch. iii. 16, 17), "Simon he surnamed *Peter*, and James and John (the sons of Zebedee) he surnamed *Boanerges;* and (ch. viii. 29, 30, 33) he saith unto *them*, But whom say *ye* that I am? And Peter answereth and saith unto him, Thou art the Christ. And he charged *them* that they should tell no man of him. But when he had turned about, and looked on his *disciples*, he *rebuked Peter*, saying, *Get thee behind me, Satan*," &c.

St. Luke says (ch. vi. 13, 14), "And when it was day he called unto him his *disciples*, &c. Simon (whom he also named Peter) and Andrew his brother, &c. And (ch. ix. 20, 21), He said unto *them*, But whom say *ye* that I am? Peter, answering, said, The Christ of God. And he straitly charged *them*, and commanded *them* to tell no man that thing."

St. John says (ch. i. 42), "And when he had beheld him, he said, Thou art Simon, the son of Jona; thou shalt be called Cephas, which is, by interpretation, a *stone*."

Such are the relations of the circumstance by Mark, Luke, and John, upon which Popery has raised her baseless superstructure of *supremacy!* And so very little did the evangelical Apostle (St. John) think of *Her* superstitious *rock*, that he merely interprets *Cephas* a common *stone*.

Such are our proofs of the impious assumptions of Popery in the express language of Christ himself and his Apostles. We have entered more at large upon this part of our subject, in the sincere hope that Papists may be induced to examine them. We now proceed to show, from official Papal documents, how far this *supremacy* extends had Popery the power

of enforcing it; and that THIS assumption of Popish Bishops in its very *essence* is the *direct contrast* of *Christianity*.

Let us, then, for a moment, place reason, authority, evidence, proof, conviction, and common sense, out of the question;—let us suppose, that the language of our Saviour and his Apostles was intended to imply the directly opposite meaning to that which it so clearly expresses; and having done this, let us imagine for an instant, first, that St. Peter was ordained by Christ to be the "Prince of the Apostles," that his supremacy was confirmed previous to the crucifixion; and secondly, that he is *proved* to have been at Rome, and to have died Bishop of that city;—this, we think, is pushing falsehood as far as Popery herself can wish it upon this point, and as far from the truth as possible? Yet, what would all these unmerited concessions prove in her favour, unless the tenets she urges as essentially necessary to salvation be those taught by St. Peter himself? Popery dare not, as we have already said, publicly deny that *Christ's* is a *spiritual* kingdom, and that Peter preached his doctrines.

We now purpose to examine the *spirituality* of Popery, as it is most clearly to be understood by her pontificals, canons, decretals, &c. By the third canon of the fourth Council of Lateran (held A.D. 1215) we become acquainted with the *spiritual* power which Popery has assumed of *deposing princes*, and *absolving* their subjects from their *allegiance*, not merely because she may choose to *call* such princes, *infected* with opinions contrary to her own, *heretics*, but if they do not exterminate all others who *are* to be deemed *heretics out* of their *dominions*. This is the doctrine *still* maintained by the Church of Rome *, had she the means of enforcing it. By the decree of the *Bulla in Cœna Domini* †, the Popes

* "The creed of Pius," Mr. Butler says, "sanctions the decisions of the Council of Lateran, as well as those of Trent."—*Book of Rom. Cat. Church.*

† This diabolical document, *The LXIIIrd Constitution of Paul V.*, after stating its object, viz. "The excommunication and anathematization of all heretics whatsoever," &c., and referring to about *five-and-twenty similar denunciations* of his prede-

declare themselves *monarchs of the world*, by which we learn what is meant by the *Regalia of St. Peter*, *Rights of the Apostolic Chair*, &c. This *spiritual* language is, however, no more than is addressed to every Pope on his corona-

---

cessors, ends his *proem* with this comfortable intelligence, "Another like excommunication, usually published on Maunday Thursday, is extant in the LXIInd Constitution of our *Holy Lord*, Urban VIII." This Bull, published by the "Servant of the servants of God," (*Servus Servorum Dei,*) contains thirty sections, and each section teeming with curses against all the rest of mankind, if they dissent from the tenor of this Bull, not forgetting those of the Romish clergy who, in *charity*, might be induced to *pardon*. We give the following specimens by which it will be seen how carefully murder is guarded against *at Rome*. Every section begins with a "We excommunicate," &c.

Sect. 10. "*Item, Excommunicamus et anathematizamus omnes interficientes, mutilantes, vulnerantes, detinentes, capientes, seu deprædentes Romipetas seu perigrinos ad Urbem causa Devotionis accidentes, et in ea morantes, vel ab ipsa recedentes, et in his dantes auxilium, concilium vel favorem.*"

Sect. 10. "Further, We excommunicate and anathematize all who kill, maim, wound, detain, apprehend, or rob, travellers to Rome, or pilgrims, for the sake of devotion, going to that city, *staying* there, or *returning* from it; and those who give aid, counsel, or favour, in these cases."

Ought not the *spiritual* protection of Popery to extend further than merely to those who present to her their offerings? Surely those who have nothing to give ought not to be murdered with impunity.

Sect. 13. "Further, We excommunicate and anathematize all those, as well ecclesiastics as seculars, of whatsoever dignity they be, who, under pretence of a certain *frivolous appeal from the injustice*, (*qui prætextentes frivolam quandam appellationem a gravamine*, &c. &c.,) . . . . of decrees issuing from Us, &c., have recourse to *secular courts* and the *lay power*," &c. &c. &c.

Sect. 23. "If by chance any person shall, against the tenor of these presents, *de facto*, presume to bestow the *benefit of absolution* upon any such involved in excommunication and anathema, or any of them, we include *them* in the sentence of excommunication, and shall afterwards proceed more severely against them both by *spiritual* and *temporal* punishments, as We shall think most convenient."

We have quoted from these sections at random, and will now give an extract of the first, and the whole of the last:—

Sect. 1. "We excommunicate and anathematize in the name of [must we repeat the blasphemy?] God Almighty, Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, and by the authority of the blessed Apostles, Peter and Paul, and *by our own*, all Hussites, Wickliffites, Lutherans, Zuinglians, Calvinists, Hugonots, Anabaptists, Trinitarians," (*a*) &c. &c. &c.

We give the last section as in the original:—

Sect. 30. "*Nulli ergo omnino hominum liceat hanc paginam nostræ excommunicationis, anathematizationis, interdicti, innovationis, innodationis, declarationis, protestationis, sublationis, revocationis, commissionis, mandati et voluntatis infringere, vel ei ausu temerario contraire. Siquis autem hoc attentare præsumpserit, indignationem Omnipotentis Dei ac Beatorum Petri et Pauli Apostolorum ejus se noverit incursurum.*"

Sect. 30. "Let no man, therefore, infringe, or boldly and rashly oppose, this our Letter of Excommunication, Anathematization, Interdict, Innovation, Innodation, Declaration, Protestation, Abolition, Revocation, Commission, Command, and Pleasure. But, if any one shall presume to attempt it, let him know that he shall *incur the displeasure of Almighty God*, and his blessed Apostles Peter and Paul!!!"

(*a*) Are not Papists Trinitarians, or does the Pope deny the belief in the Trinity?

tion as it stands in the Pontifical at the present time. When the *Tiara*, or *triple* crown, is placed upon his head (JESUS wore a crown of thorns !) the act is accompanied with these words :—" Receive this diadem, adorned with three crowns ; and know yourself to be Father of Princes and Kings, RULER OF THE WORLD, and Vicar upon Earth of our Saviour Jesus Christ * ! ! ! "

Such is a brief specimen of Popish *spirituals !* Does this *lording it over God's heritage* accord with the mild exhortations of St. Peter ? Was it to become *Governor of the world He* sought, or did he deal damnation to all who did not acknowledge his *supremacy* † ? No ; *he* told those (the men of Lystra) who would have worshipped *him* to forbear, and that he was a man of like passions to themselves ;—but the passions of Popery are surely like nothing human ;—when in the zenith of her power, every successful usurpation but created new desires, as though the appetites of pride and avarice " increased by what they fed on." What could have induced Popes to sell commissions, or indulgences to commit crime, and pardons to the perpetrators after it was committed—to create the *Right of Sanctuary* ‡ for the protection of the midnight murderer—to take upon themselves the impious ceremony of *making* Saints, and thus coupling some of the vilest

---

* *Accipe Thyaram Tribus Coronis ornatam ; et scias te esse Patrem Principum et Regum ; Rectorem Orbis ; in Terra Vicarium Salvatoris nostri Jesu Christi !*

† As nothing recorded of St. Peter (except his denial of Christ) can be compared with the asseverations of Popery, the latter felt it to be *expedient* to produce *some* documents as vouchers of her *supreme right* of persisting in her crimes. Donations, Decretals, &c., were *forged* by the Popes of the ninth century, by whom, Mosheim says, " those means were looked upon as *most lawful* that *tended best to the accomplishment of their purposes*," and " by which it might *appear*, that, in the first ages of the Church, the Roman Pontiffs were clothed with the same *spiritual majesty* which they now assumed." *Maclaine's Eng. Trans.* vol. ii. p. 23. See also *Cave's Lit. Hist.* vol. ii. p. 21.

‡ Boniface V. has the honour of affording sanctuary to the robber and assassin in the first age of Popery ; and the first example of a Roman Pontiff *making a saint (!)* on his own individual authority was given by John XV., A. D. 993, who *sainted*, or canonized Udalric, Bishop of Augsburg, for " *Christians* to worship." Provincial councils, &c., afterwards performed the same impieties on the behalf of their friends and patrons ; but in the twelfth century this right of saint-making was taken by Alexander III. into his own hands.

monsters in creation with the inspired of heaven?—In short, what have been the distinguishing features of Popery from the first period of her existence, in the seventh century, up to the present hour? PRIDE and AVARICE, the parents of CRUELTY, by the aid of which latter the Church of Rome has ever, where she had the power of doing so, offered up a bloody sacrifice on the shrine of her favourite idols! These are facts which, we repeat, History decides—The *Christian doctrine of St. Peter* is to be found in his epistles, &c. contained in the New Testament *.

CONCLUSION.

Have you any thing more to add in confirmation of all these tenets contained in your profession of faith?

I shall add no more than this, that having already proved in the first chapter, that the Church in communion with *Rome* is the true and only Church of Christ, and consequently her councils and pastors the guides of divine appointment, which Christ has established to be our conductors in the way to a happy eternity: it follows that we should, without further hesitation, believe and profess what they believe and profess; and condemn and reject what they condemn and reject; assuring ourselves that by doing thus we shall secure, since we shall follow those guides which Christ himself has appointed, whom he has commanded us to hear, and with whom he has promised to abide to the end of the world.

Why do you in your profession of faith make a declaration of receiving in particular the doctrine of the council of Trent?

Because this was the last general council called in opposition to the new doctrine of *Luther* and *Calvin:* and therefore we particularly declare our assent to the decrees of this council, as being levelled against those heresies which have been most prevalent in these two last ages.

May the God of unity, peace, and truth, by his infinite mercy conduct all *christians* to unity, peace, and truth. *Amen, Amen.*

---

* The name of Simon was changed to Peter, as were the names of James and John to Boanerges, or *the Sons of Thunder* ("thereby," says Ashton, "representing the great power of the Gospel,"): but the first example of Popes changing their own names, on their accession, was given, in the tenth century, by Octavian, (son of Albertus, Marquess of Tuscany,) that monster of innate cruelty, lust, and atheism, who was put into the Papal chair at the *venerable* age of *seventeen years*, under the title of Benedict VI., who was afterwards deposed by another *Pope*, re-instated, again deposed, and ultimately strangled in prison.

Were it possible to have proved *Falsehood to be Fact*, Pius IV., by such means, might have proved that he and all other Popes entered upon their ecclesiastical functions by "Divine appointment*." Neither does it "*follow*" that men should, "*without further hesitation, believe and profess what they believe and profess;*" because St. Paul tells us (Gal. vi. 4, 5), to *let every man prove his own work, and then shall he have rejoicing in himself alone, and not in another; for every man shall bear his own burden.* However Popery may "condemn and reject" the Holy Scriptures (as we have shown in the course of this work she does), yet "*Christians, indeed,*" should ever "hesitate" before they allow themselves to be influenced by so pernicious an example.

The last "*because,*" assigned for "receiving," *in particular,* "the doctrine of the Council of Trent," is, we think, as ill chosen as it is intemperately expressed. If Protestants could give no better reason for *their* profession of faith than that it was "*levelled*" at some *other* profession, we should cease to be Protestants. The Council of Trent was summoned to complete its Sittings by this very Pius; and surely, as a Minister of "Divine Appointment," he had been better employed in more clearly expounding the merits of *his own* doctrine than in *levelling* anathemas at those who convinced the world—by their introduction of the Scriptures in the vulgar tongue—that he laboured under a fatal error. However, *levelling decrees* against *the whole Christian world*, who dis-

* "The history of the Popes presents a lively and horrible picture of the complicated crimes that dishonoured the ministers of the Church, who were peculiarly obliged, by their sacred office, to exhibit to the world distinguishing models of piety and virtue. Such of the sacerdotal order as were advanced to places of honour and authority in the Church, behaved rather like tyrants than rulers, and showed, manifestly, in all their conduct, that they aimed at an *absolute* and *unlimited dominion.* The *Popes, more especially,* inculcated that pernicious maxim, 'That the Bishop of Rome is the *Supreme Lord of the Universe,* and that neither *Princes* nor Bishops, *Civil Governors* nor Ecclesiastical Rulers, have any *lawful* power *in Church or State* but what they derive from *him.*' This extravagant maxim, which was nourished as the *sum* and *substance of Papal jurisprudence,* the Roman Pontiffs maintained obstinately, and left no means unemployed that *perfidy* or *violence* could suggest to give it the force of universal law!"—*Mosheim.* Could such a description of beings as *these* have been *appointed by* CHRIST? We answer, *NO!*

sent from Popery, and whom she arrogantly calls "heretics," has been her constant practice, since Pride first hatched her into life: such men, as St. Paul says, "*profess* that they know God, but in *works* they *deny* him." In the concluding apostrophe we sincerely join; and pity the unchristian fanatics whom Popery has taught to vent curses upon the rest of the world, which has recoiled, and ever must recoil, upon themselves; since "thou art *inexcusable*, O man, whosoever thou art that judgest; for wherein *thou judgest another, thou condemnest thyself*," (Rom. ii. 1); whilst, as St. Paul said of the intolerant Jews who called *him* a "heretic*," so may a Protestant say of the equally intolerant Popes who evince their rabid malice toward every human being who prefers the doctrines of CHRIST HIMSELF to *theirs*—(Acts xxiv. 14)—*After the way which* THEY *call* HERESY, *so worship I the God of my fathers, believing all things which are written in the law and the Prophets.*

* "*A pestilent fellow*," "*a mover of sedition*," "*a ring-leader of a sect*," &c. (Acts xxiv. 5.) Is not this exactly the same language that is applied by Popery to our first Reformers?

APPENDIX.

THIS is the effusion, we presume, of the learned Dr. Challoner, "in which, it is said, "are briefly proposed the motives, or *Rational* Inducements to the (*Roman*) *Catholic* Faith." If by this expression the Doctor would imply that there is *no* "*rational* inducements" afforded by the Pope's "Grounds of Faith" for such a dangerous experiment, we heartily concur with him in opinion, and willingly turn to something "proposed" by himself, which may prove Popery to be a somewhat less evil than the Pope himself has shown it to be.

The "Appendix" of Dr. Challoner contains copious extracts from *Protestant* writers to show the *purity* of Popery; but as Protestants read their own authors, we need not here repeat what the latter say upon *this* point. Enough of the Papal method of tacking sentences together for the purpose of misapplying them has been already shown, to form an opinion of its merits; nor can it be doubted that if Protestants did not prefer the religion of Christ to the dogmas of Popery they would become Papists. Augustine is also quoted in proof of the Catholic—not the *Popish*—Church being the Church of Christ—Gregory, who sent him to England, declared Popery to be the *Antichrist*, and Augustine taught the doctrines of that Bishop. Protestants believe the same. A mere *precedence* of Bishops would be a matter of no importance to the Christian world, whether at Rome, London, or Jerusalem, nor would have broken their communion—Popery did this when she chose to become infallible.

To these quotations succeeds an *Addenda*, from the writings of Vincent of Lerins, in proof that "*a true Catholic loves the word of God*," as all Protestants believe;—it is the *Romanist*

alone, who is taught to put aside His Holy Word for the fabulous legends of Popery; and as the latter did not exist until *after* Vincent wrote (in the fifth century, and who, by the way, was deemed a Semi-Pelagian*, or *heretic*), of course Popery is not spoken of; but he thus speaks, according to the translation of Dr. Challoner (p. 89) of the superstitions (as we have already described them) that in his own time had disfigured the primitive Christianity:—"I am astonished at the extravagance of some men, at that complication of impiety and blindness; in a word, at that strange insatiable lust after *novelty in religion*, that they cannot rest *contented* with the *old Rule of Faith*, once delivered and deposited in the Primitive Church, but must be every day upon *new* researches, and are never well but when they are *adding* (to), *altering*, or *curtailing Christianity;* as if the doctrine was not from heaven, or one Revelation sufficient," &c. Yet, even *this* condemnation of their practice, Papists are told they must believe is a proof of the *Christianity* of *Popery!*—People denied a perusal of the Scriptures may be persuaded to believe *anything*.

Quitting the remarks of other writers quoted by the Doctor, we shall now confine ourselves to his own

"RATIONAL INDUCEMENTS TO THE ROMAN CATHOLIC FAITH."

"1. The first reformer, *Martin Luther*, had nothing of extraordinary edification in his life and conversation. On the contrary, all his works declare him to have been a man of an implacable nature, rigidly self-willed, impatient of contradiction, and rough and violent in his declamations against all those, of what quality soever, who dissented in the least from him. But what was the most scandalous in a pretended restorer of the purity of religion, was his marrying a nun, after the most solemn vows by which both he and she had consecrated themselves to God in the state of perpetual continency. In

* Pelagius was a monk of Britain, and preached against the doctrine of original sin—that man was born in a pure state of innocence, and that, without Divine Grace, he might, of himself, obtain salvation, by good works, &c.

which he was imitated by a great part of the first reformed ministers.

"2. He and his first associates were certainly schismatics, because they separated themselves from all Churches, pure or impure, true or false, that were then upon earth, and stood alone upon their own bottom. Therefore, if there was any such thing then in the world as *the true Church of Christ* (as there must always be if the scripture and creed be true), *Luther* and his followers separating from all Churches, must have separated from the true Church, and, consequently, must have been schismatics. '*At first*,' says *Luther*, in the Preface to his works, '*I was alone*.' Which is confirmed by Dr. *Tillotson*, Serm. 49, p. 588; and Mr. *Collier*, in his Historical Dictionary, under *Martin Luther*, where he praises his magnanimity in having *opposed himself alone to the whole earth*.

"3. It appears from his book *de Miss. Privata & Unct. Sacerd. T.* 7. Wit. *fol.* 228, &c., that he learnt no small part of his Reformation from the Father of lies, in a nocturnal conference, of which he there gives his readers an account."

When we meet with intentionally false quotations of the Scriptures—when we see additions made to them in one place, and subtractions in another; and when they are interpolated with profane matter, for the mere purpose of obscuring that which is in itself clear and explicit, an ordinary Christian may stand excused for expressing his disapprobation of such improprieties with some little warmth. When, however, a challenge is fairly given in the writer's own words, an opponent should allow the same freedom of opinion to others that he claims for himself; and, if he cannot convince, should never descend to abuse.

We think Doctor Challoner should have thought of this maxim, since Luther's conduct, be it what it might, could not make CHRISTIANITY more nor less than what it really WAS and IS, although good doctrines are always most powerfully enforced by bright examples. If Luther and the Reformed Ministers "married Nuns," as the Doctor says, it proves the ladies had ceased to be *novices before* they were married;

and if they felt that by entering the married state they should be better members of society, surely the Reformed Ministers did much better by becoming their lawful protectors than many of the *unreformed* of the Popish clergy of the present day, who do much *worse* than marrying? The Doctor should not be angry that monks and nuns, after becoming Protestants, did not keep their unnatural vows; we admit it was wrong to have *entered* into them; but it was in *keeping* an ill-made oath that Herod beheaded John the Baptist. It is not the religion of Christ to *make* such vows—Priests *all* make them as well as nuns, and as they are not *expected* to keep them, we repeat (although we decline entering into this subject unnecessarily) that, on the score of morality, at least, they had better marry. However, Luther did *not* separate himself from the Church of Christ; but by separating from the *Pope* (who really *was* what is literally understood as the *Romish Church, i. e.* Supreme and Infallible, above all councils, &c.—*See Mosh. Eng. Trans.* v. 3, p. 150)—by *this* separation, we say, he drew himself by so much nearer to Christ. Whether or not an *evil* spirit tempted him it is hardly worth while to inquire; but of this we are sure:—he committed ONE act for which the spirit of Popery will never absolve him, viz.,—He introduced the SCRIPTURES *in the* VULGAR TONGUE.

Our object in the preceding pages has been to *contrast Popery with Christianity*, and not to go out of our way for the mere purpose of attacking or defending any individual; but, we may add, learned men are not all of Dr. Challoner's opinion with respect to Luther:—"He could not have been supported against the Church of Rome, except by an open breach and force of arms. Had he fallen in with the mild and *timid* measures, so often recommended to him by Erasmus, the Reformation in Germany would soon have been stifled by a bloody Inquisition, as it was in Spain and other countries."—*Eveleigh.*

"Luther had as much courage as Alexander and Julius Cæsar put together."—*Jorton's Life of Eras.*

"Luther was truly great and unparalleled; as a philosopher he embraced the doctrines of the Nominalists, (the system of his order,) while, in divinity, he chiefly followed

the sentiments of *Augustine;* but in *both* he *preferred the decisions of Scripture and right reason* before the authority and opinions of fallible men."—*Mosheim.* For further accounts of Luther we refer our readers to all impartial ecclesiastical writers since the Reformation.

" 4. Those that were the most busy in promoting the Reformation here at home, were, for the most part, men of most wretched characters, such as King *Henry* VIII., and the leading men in the government during the minority of *Edward* VI., not to speak of the ministry of Queen *Elizabeth, the most wicked,* says a late *protestant* historian (*Short View of Eng. Hist.* p. 273) *that ever was known in any reign.*

" 5. The foundations of the Reformation in *England* were laid in manifold sacrileges, in pulling down monasteries and other houses consecrated to God, rifling and pillaging churches, alienating church-lands, *&c.*, as may be seen in the History of the Reformation by Dr. *Heylin.*

" 6. The Reformation was everywhere introduced by lay authority, and for the most part in direct opposition to, and contempt of the bishops, the church guides of divine appointment. A proceeding manifestly irregular and unjustifiable, that in church matters the laity, with a few of the inferior clergy, and those under the ecclesiastical censures, should take upon them to direct those whom Christ appointed to be their directors.

" 7. *England* herself, which glories most in the regularity of her Reformation, compared to the tumultuous proceedings of reformers abroad, owes her present establishment of the Church to the lay authority of Queen *Elizabeth* and her Parliament, in opposition to all the Bishops then sitting, (who were all but one displaced for their non-conformity,) to the whole convocation, and both the Universities: that is, in a word, to the whole clergy of the kingdom; as appears from *Fuller, L.* 9., and Dr. *Heylin,* Hist. of the Ref. p. 285, 286.

" 8. Wheresoever the Reformed Gospel was preached, it brought forth seditions, tumults, rebellions, *&c.*, as appears from all the histories of those times. Insomuch, that in

France alone the reformed gospellers, besides innumerable other outrages, are said to have destroyed no less than twenty thousand churches. *Jerusalem* and *Babel*, p. 158. How little does such a Reformation resemble the first establishment of the Church of Christ."

Protestant historians never attempt to justify the vices of their Kings, as do Papists those of their Popes: but we think it shows a great lack of judgment to scold the authors of the Reformation, unless the Reformation itself can be proved an evil.

It is the *doctrines* of Christianity, as professed by Protestants, that the Doctor set out with: those who restored them to their more pristine excellence it is of little moment to condemn, even if Popery be pleased to insist on their being as criminal as *Judas Iscariot*. The Reformation "must stand," says Maclaine, "by its own intrinsic dignity, and is in no way affected by the views or characters of its instruments." There is no doubt but the BEST act of Henry's life was his forwarding it—an act in which the best of Christian princes might glory. The bloody reign of Queen Mary was succeeded by "the most wicked *ministry* ever known in any reign," says the Doctor, quoting an apparently anonymous "*Short View of English History*." If it was really Dr. Challoner's belief that the reign of Elizabeth *was* the most wicked ever known, *his* view of historical fact must have been *very* short indeed.

We declared against mingling politics with our observations on the work of Pope Pius, and trust we have kept our word; but we must here observe that it ill becomes a British Minister of any Church to instil into the minds of youth that the Reformation, by which England shook off the yoke of Popery, was an act of "*wickedness*": it was an act which enabled Christians to commune with their God, and which at the same time freed their land for ever from the merciless power of a foreign enemy*.

* When Sir Edward Karne apprized Pope Paul IV., that Elizabeth had succeeded to the throne, the insolent Pontiff expressed his astonishment at her *presumption* in so doing without *his* approbation. He declared that England was held *in fee of the See of Rome*, that Elizabeth was illegitimate, and could not reign! Pius IV. sanctioned

It is but natural for Popery to deplore the loss of the treasures she had amassed, with the certainty of being for ever deprived of the same means of creating them. The ready sale of pardons and indulgences was *confined* when the ecclesiastical property changed hands. But whilst we condemn Henry VIII. for seizing it, was it not quite as usefully employed, we ask, in its distribution among the people from whom it originally came, as in supporting an ignorant and useless host of indolent monks, &c.* It is an idle affectation to sigh over the *lay authority* of the Protestant Church; the Papist, so injudicious, must be ignorant of our 37th Church Article—"*We give not* to our Princes the ministering either of God's word or of the Sacraments," &c. The Pope *claims a temporal power over the whole Christian world!* We may also hint, if history is to be believed, that many of the houses of nuns and friars were consecrated to far less sacred purposes than those assigned by Dr. Challoner. We scarcely know what he means by "a *few only* of his clergy under ecclesiastical censures," and "one Bishop," who were not "displaced for non-conformity." "*Out of nine thousand and four hundred beneficed clergymen in England, there were but one hundred and twenty who refused to comply with the Reformation.*" *Guth. 22d Edit. What the Reformation* (*not* "the re-

---

the acts of hostility of his predecessor, and extended them by his own. He granted a Bull to Francis II. of France (who formed a treaty with Philip II.(*a*) of Spain, for the extermination of "heretics") declaring Elizabeth illegitimate; and Mary Queen of Scots was to be crowned Queen of England. The successor of Pius IV. was (*Saint*) Pius V., who excommunicated the lawful Queen, and *absolved* her subjects from their allegiance to her "as a heretic and favourer of heretics"—(her own Protestant subjects!) when the *wicked, heretical Elizabeth* passed an act for the preservation of herself and her kingdom, denying a Popish authority for the destruction of both or either of them.

* Whilst we contend for the *necessity* of the Reformation of Popish doctrines, and acknowledge the universal benefit of its happy results, let us not be understood as the advocates of a single atrocity committed by any individual whatsoever, whether sovereign or subject. Henry VIII. was not the only evil instrument, nor the first, whom Providence has made use of to effect his own wise and inscrutable purposes; but whilst we condemn the excesses of those who disgraced the cause they espoused, we ask, with Mr. Townsend, if the religion of those who threw bones, rags, and wood, into the flames, was not quite as pure as that which not only taught it to be essential to salvation to adore them, but which actually condemned the wretch to a similar fate who denied it?

(*a*) This was the Papal bigot who had been the husband of "bloody Mary," the predecessor and sister of Elizabeth, and who, with the approbation of the Pope, sought to marry the latter. Elizabeth declining the honour of his hand, he, *in proof of his love to herself and subjects,* equipped his *Armada,* which the Pope "blessed," and which British seamen blew out of the water.

formed," but *the* "Gospel" of Christ) has produced, every reader can judge. It has produced that which is best calculated to exalt our nature—*the knowledge of divine truth;* it has produced liberty of conscience and of expression, blessings of which the Doctor has amply availed himself in the publication before us. In what country, we ask, subject to *Papal authority*, though Massacre had gauntly stalked forth in open day, would he have dared to assert that its CONSTITUTION WAS WICKED, *founded in* SACRILEGE, *and upheld by* ROBBERY? Further comment we deem unnecessary; the above paragraphs are, we repeat, cut out of the printed text, and therefore stand as the Doctor himself corrected them. Those referring to Heylin and Fuller are *not correctly quoted;* but we would not have quarrelled with the Doctor had he confined his expressions of disapprobation to any specific acts of injustice which accompanied the great national change in question, and which are too often attendant on great national changes; but we must ever condemn the *Englishman* who, under the guise of religion, would seek to instil into the minds of his fellow-subjects, that the "*lay authority*," which protects his person and property, is "*unjustifiable*," *because* it *restored** that independence to a groaning kingdom which Popery too long had trampled under foot, by assisting in the work of what he, in the meekness of Priestly hope, may be pleased to distinguish as a "*pretended* Reformation." The vulgarity of some of Dr. Challoner's expressions we shall not stop to notice; we deem it unworthy of a "*Gospeller*," and a gentleman.

"9. The fruits of the Reformation were such as could not spring from a good tree. 1. An innumerable spawn of heresies. 2. Endless dissensions. 3. A perpetual itch of changing, and inconstancy in their doctrine. 4. *Atheism*,

* Our William I. denied the right of Papal authority in England, *permitting* Pope Gregory VII's. Legate to sit in Council, acting, at the same time, according to his own will; he exerted the right of investiture, and actually decided on all matters relating to the Church. His successor (William II.) also maintained his prerogatives to which Popery was forced to submit. Henry I. was joined by all his Bishops and Nobles in opposing the encroachments of Pope Urban II. whose Legate (Anselm) he told, that he would not permit any persons to enjoy estates in his kingdom, who refused him the securities of a subject. He gave up the right of investiture, and the Pope consented that the Bishops should do him homage.—*See Rapin, or any other credible Historian.*

Deism, Latitudinarianism, and bare-faced impiety: in fine, a visible change in manners for the worse, as many of their own writers freely acknowledge, and old *Erasmus* long ago objected to them, *Ep. ad Vultur.*, where he defies them to show him one who had been reclaimed from vice by going over to their religion; and declares he never yet met with one who did not seem changed for the worse.

"10. That religion is the best to live in which is the safest to die in, and that in the judgment of dying men, who are not like to be biassed at that time by interest, humour, or passion. Now it is certain, that thousands, who have lived *Protestants,* have desired to die *Catholics,* and never yet one that had lived a *Catholic* desired to die a *Protestant;* therefore it must be safest for us to stay where we are.

"11. That religion is preferable to all others, the doctrine and preaching of which is, and always has been, more forcible and efficacious in order to the taking off men's minds from the perishable goods of this world, and fixing them wholly on the great business of eternity; but such is the doctrine and preaching of the *Catholic* Church, as appears from those multitudes of holy solitaries in our Church that have retired themselves from all the advantages to which their birth or fortune entitled them, and abandoned all earthly hopes for the love of heaven. Whereas the Reformation has never yet produced any such fruits.

"12. There was a true saving faith in the days of our forefathers before the pretended Reformation, by which great numbers are certainly arrived at the happy port of eternal felicity. Our histories are full of instances of the charity, piety, and devotion, of kings, bishops, &c. of the old religion. Therefore it is safer to follow their faith than venture our souls in a new raised communion."

We are content to let the *fruits* of the Reformation decide the virtue of the *tree itself,* even though the hand that planted it had been as deeply soiled as the Doctor has declared it to be. But we are not quite sure that he is correct in stating *who* it was that first most forcibly attacked Popery in her strong hold of superstition, by which it was *caused;*

or that it is not attributable to the exertions of one whom all learned Papists eagerly claim as the brightest ornament of their Church—of this presently.

Four evils are expressly pointed out as the consequences of our escape from Papal thraldom; but the "*innumerable spawn of heresies*," as the Doctor has *elegantly* expressed it, float in their own streams at their own peril, without the apprehension of being *fried alive*, as in "the good old" Papal times; and if their "dissensions be endless," although the evil is undeniably a Popish relic, *intolerant* Protestantism is a stranger to the merits of "conviction, enforced by the rack or a pile of faggots."

"The *itch* of changing" we do not think so prevalent as in Popish days, not being aware of any *new articles* of FAITH having been introduced since Protestantism was established, which mankind must either believe or be condemned to eternal perdition for disputing, as the *five new Papal sacraments*, &c. Neither do we see the "bare-faced impiety" of worshipping GOD alone, rather than in dividing our adoration of HIM with his creatures and their relics and images—in seeking pardon of God rather than by applying to a Popish priest—in preferring Scripture to the unsubstantiated traditions of superstitious ages—in hearing our Church service, and joining in prayer in our vulgar tongue, to hearing it in a language we are ignorant of—nor in preferring marriage to a less honourable state of life. We may also add, that upon strong minds the consequent effect of *superstition* is *infidelity;* since he who becomes disgusted with what he (then) terms *Priest-craft*, deems all professions of Christianity alike; and thus, whilst the Papal multitude believe the Scriptures and Legends upon the *same authority* (the Church of Rome), the sceptic and the philosopher too often vainly deny both.

Of "old Erasmus" we have a few words to say, since it is he to whom we have alluded above. He died in July 1536, at the age of seventy. Romanists are determined to have Erasmus a Papist, a point indeed which we are not now about to dispute, but will merely show that Doctors differ on this subject, whilst we leave it to our readers to form their own conclusions from the language of Erasmus himself:—

"If anything seemed proper to destroy the gloomy empire

of superstition, and to alarm the security of the lordly Pontiffs, it was the *restoration of learning* in Europe, and the number of men of genius that arose of a sudden, under the benign influence of that auspicious revolution. . . . . *Erasmus* and others pointed the delicacy of their wit, or levelled the fury of their indignation at the superstitions of the times, the corruptions of the priesthood, the abuses that reigned in the Court of Rome, and the brutish manners of the monastic orders."—*Mosheim.*

" It was not Luther nor Zuinglius that contributed so much to the Reformation as Erasmus, especially among us in England; for Erasmus was the man who awakened men's understandings, and brought them from the *Friar's* divinity to a relish of general learning."—*Stillingfleet.*

" He [Erasmus] as was commonly said of the Reformation, laid the egg, and Luther hatched it."—*Eveleigh.*

" As soon as Bologna surrendered to the arms of Pope Julius II.—[' To whose odious list of vices,' says Mosheim, ' we may add the *most savage ferocity*, the *most audacious arrogance*, the *most despotic vehemence of temper*, and the *most extravagant and frenetic passion for war and bloodshed!* ']—Erasmus returned, and beheld the Pope's magnificent entry into the conquered town. The spectacle did not greatly edify him; he compared—(*contrasted*, we suppose, Mr. Charles Butler's means?)—as he informs us, the *Pontiff's martial* character with the *spirit of charity* inculcated in *every page of the Gospel**; *his lofty* and *imperious demeanour*, with *Christian humility;* and the *costly magnificence* which environed him, with the lowly circumstances and manners of HIM who was meek and humble of heart; and who himself preached these meek and humble virtues to his followers. These reflections gave rise to the celebrated Dialogue, ' *Julius Exclusus;*' or, *Julius shut out from Heaven*, an *admirable satire.* . . . . It imports to be a dialogue between *St. Peter* and *Julius.* With an equal mixture of *bit-*

* The somewhat *dangerous* admissions to Romanism *will* occasionally slip from the pens of the most liberal and learned of Romanists themselves. If " the *spirit of charity*" be " *inculcated in every page of the Gospel,*" how uncharitable is Popery to withhold it from general perusal! Protestants rely upon it as their guide to salvation; and " old Erasmus" was also of the same opinion. He *published his Greek Testament* in 1516, the year preceding the Reformation, previous to which (Jortin, quoting Stillingfleet, says) there was but *one in all Germany!*

terness and pleasantry [we should suppose Popery would feel the *pleasantry* the *most* bitter of the two?] the pilot of the Galilæan lake *reproaches Julius with* his *unchristian* conduct; laughs at his deeds of arms, exposes the folly of his pompous magnificence, and finally *shuts the door of heaven upon him."—Mr. C. Butler.*

Erasmus was, undoubtedly, one of the most learned men of any age; yet, must not Romanists think him very foolish to shut the man out of heaven, when he (they say) *knew* that the Pope himself *must always possess the key* of it? We think it unnecessary to make any further quotations in proof of Erasmus being a Papist:—it is admitted, on all sides, that there was an epistolary correspondence between him and Henry VIII. (the latter writing to him with his own hand)—that he visited England five times (the last in 1517, the year of the Reformation), and that his motive for quitting it was the fear of the plague to which this country was then subject. We will now see what Erasmus himself says of Luther and the Reformation.

As Councillor of Charles V., Emperor of Germany, Erasmus was at the Diet of Cologne, A.D. 1520, at which Frederick, Elector of Saxony, was present also. The latter was a warm supporter of the Reformation, and, of course, a great admirer of Luther. Wishing much to have the candid opinion of Erasmus on this important subject, he sent his almoner, Spalatinus, with an invitation, that he would wait upon him, which he did (on the 5th of December). The conversation that followed, between Frederick, Erasmus, and Spalatinus, is thus related by the latter:—

"The Elector then desired Erasmus *freely* to give him his opinion concerning Luther? Erasmus, pressing his lips close together, stood musing, and delaying to give an answer; whilst Frederick, as it was his way when he was discoursing earnestly with any one, fixed his eyes steadily upon him, and stared him full in the face. At last, Erasmus brake out into these words:—'*Luther hath been guilty of two crimes: he hath touched the Pope upon the crown, and the Monks upon the belly.*' . . . . Erasmus at that time [*full three years after the Reformation had commenced*] judged so favourably of Luther's doctrine, that

when he had taken leave of the Elector, and Spalatinus had conducted him back to the house where he then lodged, he immediately set down and wrote some *axioms*, as he called them, and gave them to Spalatinus. . . . . The subject of these axioms was:—

"'That *good men*, and *lovers of the Gospel*, were those who had taken the least offence at Luther; that they were much displeased at the cruelty of the Bull*, so unworthy of the mild and merciful Vicar of Jesus Christ; that two Universities had, indeed, *condemned* Luther, but had *not confuted* him; that his request was very reasonable, to be tried by unsuspected judges; that he could not be suspected of evil designs, since he sought for no profit and advantage to himself; that the Pope was more solicitous about his own glory, than about the honour of Jesus Christ; that the treatises written against Luther were disapproved even by those who dissented from Luther; that the world was *now* influenced with a vehement love and longing for *evangelical truth;* and that such a disposition was not to be *odiously checked* and *oppressed;* and, lastly, that it was very improper for Charles [who was won over by the Pope] to begin the exercise of his imperial power with inauspicious acts of severity and violence." Such were the sentiments of "old Erasmus," and Protestants agree in them. The above extract is from Dr. *Jortin's Life of Erasmus, and is quoted also by Mr. C. Butler himself in his work upon the same subject.*

Doctor Challoner is right in making the most of "dying men"—it is a sort of fundamental point with Popery to do so. When "a dying man" is worn down by pain and weakness, all the Priest's object is to *catch* him if he can, and publish his *conversion*. For this end the patient is promised heaven, if he will recant—eternal perdition, if he will not: charitably to let the Christian die in peace with hope in his God alone is

* Pope Leo X. issued a Bull against Luther on the 15th June, 1520, in which forty-one pretended heresies, extracted from the works of the latter, were condemned, his writings ordered to be publicly burned, and himself summoned to confess and retract his "errors" under pain of excommunication. Luther appealed from the Pope to a General Council, had a pile of faggots raised without the walls of the city of Wittemburg, and amidst an immense assemblage of all ranks, he cast into the flames the Bull, and also the Decretals and Canons relating to the *Pope's Supremacy*.

not to be thought of nor expected; and we have known where other attempts have failed, the Scriptures to have been clandestinely removed, and Popish effusions introduced in their place.

With the numerous extracts which we have quoted from Romish writers before them, it may appear to our readers a task of supererogation in Dr. Challoner to have spoken of the religion of Popery, "taking off men's minds from the perishable goods of this world?"—By her own showing she would be very well contented with "the perishable goods of this world," even though she were to encompass them *all* within her own grasp. Nor do we think it very *prudent* of the Doctor to have said so much more than his master on the subject of the "holy solitaries" of his church*. We have given a few specimens of what has *sometimes* been the consequences of the holiness of these ladies and gentlemen; and if it were a subject we felt inclined to dwell upon, we could illustrate our observations by referring to almost every Papal government under the sun which furnishes ample *fruits* of Monkish morality. Suppose Spain (as thoroughly Popish a kingdom as heart could wish) were to be named as the test of our assertion:—is there, we ask, *a single province* that could not exhibit a battalion of *Minors* in proof of the *self-denial* of the brawny pillars of the Romish Church? We certainly were not aware that young ladies generally "abandoned" the "advantages of birth and fortune" to retire to convents; we feared they were too often the victims of parental inhumanity to increase the fortunes of "the unwieldy heir." However, these ladies generally carry their "*welcome*" along with them; it is not *merely* a religious turn of mind that qualifies a young lady for the constant inmate of a nunnery. We recollect many years since frequently to have

* The *Mémoires de l'Académie des Institutions*, referred to by Gibbon, speaks of these *holy* people. Gibbon says, "it was with the *utmost difficulty* that ancient Rome could support the institution of *six vestals* . . . . Nor could the dread of the most horrible death always restrain their incontinency." It appears, however, that others "encountered the enemy in the closest engagements; they permitted Priests and Deacons to share their bed, and gloried amidst the flames in unsullied purity. But insulted Nature, *sometimes*, vindicated her rights, and this new species of martyrdom served only to introduce a new scandal into the Church."—*Dec. and Fall of Rom. Emp.*, Vol. ii. p. 324-5.

seen a beautiful girl in the course of her *noviciate*, who, if her story, as we heard it, was true, was, indeed one of the sad examples we have alluded to. "Whereas, the Reformation has never yet produced any *such* fruits"—*God forbid it ever should!*—If an amiable and innocent young woman enters a cloister, is her punctual performance of set prayers and penances at stated times a greater proof of virtue, and more acceptable to her Creator, than would have been fulfilling her duties as a wife, mother, daughter, sister, friend, had she mingled in all the natural endearments of social life?—Whilst instilling the principles of religion into the minds of her children, are we to be told she would thus be more forgetful of her duty to her God than in the performance of the *task* enjoined by the *rules* of her convent?

Whatever might have been the "true saving faith in the days of our forefathers," what is there in a reformation of abuses calculated to decrease the "true saving faith" of ourselves? We think it rather hyperbolical to call Popery a *saving faith*, which damns all mankind who question her infallibility. That *good* Christians should have "arrived at the happy port of eternal felicity," *whatever* their profession of faith, no good Christian, unwarped by the prejudices of education, would deny; but Popish histories of "Kings and Bishops" is no proof of *their* being there, since the prince and the pauper will a like be judged by his respective merits, for "God is no respecter of persons." That it is "*safer*" to be in communion with the Church of Rome than in the Church which retains the doctrines of CHRIST *only*, we deny; —the daily increasing numbers that leave the Romish, to join the Reformed Church, prove that the Gospel, in its dissemination, enlightens as its spreads; and, consequently, strengthens the general dissent to Dr. Challoner's assertion; both he and Pope Pius say, "*reason*" would teach mankind to become Roman Catholics—of such who are thus taught, we think the number but few indeed: but if "*reason*" can do this, it must first assure us that the doctrines of Christ and those of Popery are not opposed to each other; since, if error is to be held sacred on the score of its antiquity, Ju-

daism has a prior, and, as we think, a more feasible claim than Popery.

" 13. All ancient pretenders to reformation (*i. e.* all those that ever undertook to alter or amend the church faith) were condemned by the ancient church for *heretics*, and are acknowledged to have been such by *protestants* themselves. Therefore there is just reason to apprehend lest *protestants* walking in the same path may be involved in the same misfortune.

" 14. In fine, *protestants*, to defend the Reformation, condemned in its first appearance by the church guides of divine appointment, are forced to have recourse to a rule of faith, which, if allowed of, would set all, both ancient and modern *heretics*, out of the reach of church authority. They are forced to appeal to a tribunal, at which it is not possible that any sectary should be condemned. Such a rule, such a tribunal is the scripture, interpreted not by authority of church guides, but by every one's private judgment: for this in effect is making every one's private judgment the supreme judge both of the scripture and of all controversies in religion, and authorizing him to prefer his own whimsies before the judgment of the whole church. Could it be consistent with the wisdom and providence of God to leave his church without some more certain means of deciding controversies and maintaining unity? No, certainly.

" N. B. *That in the foregoing sheets, in quoting the scripture, we have followed the common* Protestant Bible, *for the sake of a great part of our readers that may have been accustomed to it: not designing thereby to declare our approbation of that version, much less to give it the preference to our* Catholic, Rhemish, *and* Doway *translations.*"

It may readily be admitted that all who ever sought to *amend* the Romish Church Faith have been "condemned" by the Romish Church; nay, not condemned only, but *executed* also where she had the power of reducing her theory of

extermination to practice. Protestants, however, fear not, *now*, (thank God!) of being "*involved in the same misfortune*," since, if the will of *immutable* "Old Popery" be *warm* as ever, the power has for ever fled her withering grip. Surely, the last paragraph is written in despair? Why the iteration of "Church guides of Divine appointment," and "*heretic Protestants*," whilst the only proofs of this Popish divinity must appear to the most superficial observer in an avowed longing to have these "heretics" within the pale of Papal "authority?" The abuse of Protestants, we have already observed, is no proof of the purity of Popery. Protestants are indeed *forced* to leave all *heretics* in the hands of their God; the SCRIPTURES *force* them to this, and it is no less true that they protest against a "*condemning Tribunal;*" yet, though every Protestant is permitted to walk in the light of Gospel truths, it must not be forgotten that by this means every man is enabled to acquire a knowledge of his duty towards his God, and his duty towards his neighbour; and that upon these two commandments their Saviour tells them, "HANG ALL THE LAW, AND THE PROPHETS." What more *necessary to salvation*, does Popery profess to teach? Controversy may amuse or distract schoolmen; but he who would seek the pure doctrines of Christ can only learn them from HIS OWN WORD. Let the man who cannot read have the sermon of Christ as HE delivered it on the mount, repeated to him until he get it by rote—let him make it the guide of his future life; and we would prefer his state of salvation to that of any Pope who ever slew a heretic, or issued a bull of anathematization. Popish Doctors may term this, our opinion, a "*whimsy*," perhaps—but even Roman ecclesiastical writers show the judgment of the Pope (to whose *individual judgment* "the whole church" submitted for ages) to have been ever employed in establishing his own temporal power rather than (as "Old Erasmus" said) "evincing a solicitude for the honour of Jesus Christ." The blasphemy contained in the last sentence—the taxing the CONSISTENCY of the ALMIGHTY as to his leaving some "poor worm of the earth," to decide idle controversies of atoms as fragile, is surely too gross to require further comment:—

Dr. Challoner, however, has taken upon himself to decide the question as one more instance of Popish impiety. Certain we are it is neither "*consistent*" nor CHRISTIAN thus to assume an authority of judging "the WISDOM AND PROVIDENCE OF GOD."

And now, without entering upon the mutual excommunication of Popes, and the innumerable divisions that have ever existed among the different orders of Romish ecclesiastics, we will say a few words upon the oft-repeated term, "*Unity*," which Papists are taught to believe exists in their Church. The Unity of the Primitive Christians was a *unity of faith and mutual love*, (although these were formed into respective *churches*, (as the seven churches of Asia, &c.) The attempt of Papal *supremacy* broke this unity; it has been shown by what steps Popery ultimately succeeded in her arrogant assumptions, and which, disgusting the whole Christian world, sunk her into her present comparative insignificance. She still, however, asserts her propensity; and as the imprisoned hyæna, shows his teeth through the grate which confines him, her canons, edicts, and decretals, stand unrepealed (the faithful beacon to an enlightened age!), though confined within the dark archives of the Vatican by the Reformation. English Romanists are least of all in the "*Unity*" of their own Church; we are not about to show the causes of this—these must be sufficiently obvious, when it is considered that they inhabit a free soil, where every man is tolerated to worship his Creator as is most agreeable to his own conviction.

Dr. Challoner himself speaks "of the judgment of the *whole Church*"—had he deemed his Pope to possess the supremacy claimed by his predecessors, the Doctor would not have dared to *imagine*, much less to assert that "the whole Church" had anything to do with forming a *judgment* on ecclesiastical matters at all—such reservation being claimed and exercised by the Pope *alone*, and whom his own clergy found out to be *too* supreme for them to oppose (as in the case when Gregory VII. forced them into chastity by prohibiting their cohabitation with their *own* wives). The Romanist must believe in the Unity of his Church, as he must

believe every thing else she says, and (see last new article of the Profession of Faith, p. 17) curse all and everything she commands him to condemn. Among those who ignorantly do this, such a perversion of the sense God has endued them with, *is* the "Unity" among them:—these, however, should remember that had a similar line of conduct been persevered in, when Christ came into the world, there never would have been a single Christian. Reason, however strenuously her appeal may be denied, still returns upon her opponents even against their will; not one who rejects her admonitions dare avow that he has deserted her—not one who shuns her in his worship, but will assert that she influences him to continue it. If we be in the *truth*, Reason (if consulted) will confirm us in it—if in *error*, she will convince us of it.

Perfect unity of the Spirit is not to be expected in any Church of which the righteous and the unrighteous profess themselves, and are acknowledged to be, its members. Every Christian is a member of the *Catholic Church of Christ;* but, since the existence of that of Jerusalem, there never was a Catholic Church in the sense applied by Popery to her own, *viz.*, the *head and principle of Unity*, and *mistress of all others;* these arrogant pretensions never were, nor ever will be, owned by any other Church. Members of the Church of England believe that it is their duty to live in Christian fellowship with all others, without breaking *communion* with them, so that nothing declared by the Scriptures to be *sinful* is required as the *condition* of it. This Reformed Church pronounces not that her most rebellious children *cease to be Christians*, whilst they believe in Christ—those who reject His word must answer to himself for their wilful errors; but Protestants are not taught that Papists are not Christians, although the doctrines of Popery are directly opposed to Christianity. "That which is not of faith is sin," says the Apostle; and whatsoever unrepented sins we commit here, we must answer for hereafter: but, if there were not one Christian Church upon earth in communion with another, they would not, on this account, all cease to be Catholic Churches of Christ. Popery, however, extends her *communion* to those (as we have shown by her own bulls) whom she

excommunicates; and *cutting off all the Christian* world who treat her *supremacy* with contempt, she must insist upon her *Universality*, though it reached not beyond the diocese of Rome, or was solely confined to the Pope himself, who would *then* be the "centre of Unity—the supreme, infallible, and universal Church!"

The most zealous of the Romish Church are those most ignorant of the doctrines of their Saviour, which, by every means their interested clergy can devise, are withheld from them, whilst none who dissent from the Established Church of England *have ever yet been hardy enough publicly to* CONDEMN HER TENETS. Even Popery "*blames Protestants,*" but "*for taking the bread and wine as a bare remembrance*" of their Lord's death, as he himself commanded it to be taken. Let but Roman Catholics receive the Scriptures as they have been bequeathed to all by the inspired writers of them, and if these confirm them in their belief in Popery they can still persevere in it. To induce them to such a perusal is the object of these pages. But as we have given, in his own words, Dr. Challoner's "Rational Inducements to the Roman Catholic Faith," we will now quote what we think to be much more

RATIONAL INDUCEMENTS FOR ROMANISTS TO JOIN THE COMMUNION OF THE PROTESTANT REFORMED CHURCH.

[*We copy the following Letter* verbatim et literatim, *which it may be almost unnecessary to add, caused a great "sensation," as the French term it, throughout all France. It first appeared in the* Courier Française, *and, in consequence of the rapid extent of its publication, many were led to "search the Scriptures;" to "serve God with a zeal according to knowledge;" and who, in consequence, became members of the Protestant Church. When it first appeared, every effort was made to suppress its circulation, but in vain. The* Procureur du Roi *paid a domiciliary visit to the printer, seizing all the copies of the paper they could find on his premises; and several Protestant gentlemen at Lyons, who exerted themselves in*

their circulation, were imprisoned by the Mayor. However, it appeared nothing illegal *could be proved against any of the parties, who were speedily liberated, and the impressions seized restored to the printer. M. Lefevre was a merchant, much esteemed and respected in his own neighbourhood; and editions of his Letter were printed and reprinted until there were scarcely any persons in France (except only those who feared the threatening of the Priests) who had not read it. In Lyons and its vicinity, so many became converts to the Reformed Church, that several parishes actually petitioned for Protestant ministers.*]

LETTER OF M. LEFEVRE ON HIS CONVERSION TO PROTESTANTISM.

"*Lyons, 25th June,* 1825.

"Sir,—You inquire what were the motives that actuated me in the step I have just taken, and why I have attached so much importance to becoming a member of the Christian Reformed Church; I am ready to inform you, and to open my mind to you with the utmost candour. The Gospel, my Conscience, my Reason,—these, in three words, have been my guides and advisers.

"I knew, by my own experience, that man is intended for a religious being; I felt the need of uniting myself to God by implicit faith and by worship; but I felt also that this faith and this worship ought to have nothing in them contrary to that natural light, that reason, that consciousness of right and wrong which God has implanted within us; and that every religion which should not accord with these grand principles, or should shrink from being examined upon them, could not be divine, since God cannot contradict himself, and his works cannot dread the light.

"It became, therefore, my wish to recur to the foundation of Christian faith, by studying the Holy Scriptures in the love of truth; and from that moment, I may say, a new day broke upon me. I read also some of the writings of those Fathers of the Church who lived nearest to the times of the Apostles; and they accorded with the Gospel, in convincing me that the Christian Reformed Church was the true Church of Jesus

Christ, since its faith and worship perfectly agreed with the doctrines of the Founder of Christianity, and with those of his Apostles; and since I found nothing therein opposed to my natural light.

"I thought from the first that I ought to have recourse to the Word of God alone, the divinity of which I acknowledged; and not to the opinions of men, frequently led astray by their own passions and interests; that I ought to look upon the Scripture as infallible, and to read it myself; that it must be so clear to enable me to understand whatever in it concerned my faith and practice; and that I ought not to seek the rule of that faith in human tradition. Scripture itself confirmed my opinion; for there I read that 'the law of the Lord is perfect *;'—that is, 'inspired by God, to instruct, to rebuke, to correct, and to conduct to piety and righteousness †;'—that Jesus Christ himself said to his disciples, 'Search the Scriptures;' that he condemned traditions, saying of the Scribes, 'in vain do they worship me, teaching doctrines which are only the commandments of men; for they leave the commandments of God to follow the traditions of men ‡;'—that St. Paul anathematizes all religious instruction which is not drawn from the Gospel: 'There are some that trouble you, who would overturn the Gospel of Jesus Christ; but should we ourselves, or should an angel from heaven, preach a Gospel unto you different from that which we have preached, let him be accursed §;'—that the Gospel is plain to those whom their passions blind not, as St. Paul also says: 'If the Gospel which we preached is yet veiled, it is to those who perish that it is veiled; to those unbelievers whose minds the god of this world hath blinded, in order that they may not be enlightened by the light of the Gospel of the glory of Christ, who is the image of God ||;'—that St. Ambrose also says: 'The Holy Scripture is useful to every one.' St. Chrysostom says: 'The reading of the Scriptures is a strong bulwark

---

* See the version of the Bible, by Lemaistre de Sacy, published at Paris in 1759, with the Royal approbation and privilege, by William Despiez, printer to the King and the Clergy of France. Ps. xix. 8.

† 2 Tim. iii. 16.

‡ Mark vii. 7, 8.

§ Gal. i. 8, 9.

|| 2 Cor. iv. 3, 4.

against sin; and ignorance of the Scriptures is a great precipice, a deep abyss *.'—St. Basil also tells us: 'All that is not included in the divinity-inspired Scripture, not being of faith is sin.'

"I felt, therefore, that it was my duty to examine Scripture alone, to seek therein what I ought to believe and to do. I perceived that it was the way pointed out by St. Paul himself, who, far from forbidding this examination to the people, says, 'Prove all things; approve that which is good †.'

"I dare not assent to the opinion of any church, merely as a church, nor of any council, while Jesus Christ announced, 'there shall arise false Christs and false prophets, which shall do great signs and wonders, insomuch as to deceive, if it were possible, the very elect ‡'.—St. John also says, on this subject: 'My well beloved, believe not every spirit: but try whether the spirits be of God, for many false prophets are risen in the world §.' The Abbé de Paleime himself admits, 'that the Council may err, and that, with regard to faith, private belief should be preferred to that of the Pope himself.' 'I dread Councils,' says St. Gregory of Nazianzen, 'and I have never seen any which have not done more harm than good.'

"The principles of Scripture, and of the earliest Fathers, are those of the Reformed Church; and I remarked with pleasure that she established her faith only as God and our own understandings tell us that it ought to be established. I observed that the ministers of religion were, in the Gospel, forbidden to seek temporal power, riches, and honour; that charity, meekness, and humility, were to be characteristics of the priests of Jesus Christ. Peter says unto them, 'Feed the flock of God with which you are charged, watching over its conduct, not by a forced necessity, but by a voluntary affection, which should be according to God: not by a shameful desire of gain, but by a disinterested charity; not domineering over the Lord's heritage, but becoming examples to the flock, by a virtue which springs from the

---

* St. Chrysostom, Homily on Lazarus.
† 1 Thess. v. 21.
‡ Matt. xxiv. 24.
§ 1 John iv. 1.

heart * :'—and Jesus Christ himself tells them, ' Trouble not yourselves concerning gold or silver, or money in your purse †.' He declares to them, that if they act otherwise they are but Scribes and Pharisees, whom he reproves, saying, ' They love salutations in the public places, and to be called of men master; but as for you, desire not to be called master, because you have but one master, and you are all brethren. Neither call any one on earth your father, because you have but one Father, which is in heaven; and be not called teacher, because you have but one teacher and but one master, which is Christ. He who is great among you shall be your servant: for whosoever exalteth himself shall be abased, and whosoever abaseth himself shall be exalted. Woe unto you, Scribes and Pharisees, hypocrites, because under the pretence of your long prayers you devour widow's houses. It is for this that you shall receive a more rigorous judgment. Woe unto you, for you cleanse the outside of the cup and of the platter, and yet you are within full of rapine and uncleanness ‡.'

" I observed, likewise, that their marriage was approved of by the Word of God, since it was not His will to make of them a separate caste, with interests inimical to those of society, and prevented from practising numerous virtues to which the father of a family is called. St. Paul says, ' Let them marry, for it is better to marry than to burn §.' In writing to Timothy: ' The bishop then must be blameless; he must have married but one wife; he must be sober, prudent, grave, and modest, loving hospitality, able to teach; he must not be given to wine, neither violent nor hasty to strike; but just and moderate, far from disputes, disinterested; he must govern well his own household, keeping his children in obedience, and in all propriety ‖.' He says again: ' Have we not power to lead with us a wife, who may be our sister in Jesus Christ, as do the other Apostles, and the brothers of our Lord, and Cephas ¶ ?' And St. Clement, of Alexandria, says himself, ' There are some who con-

* 1 Peter v. 2, 3.
† Matt. x. 9.
‡ Matt. xxiii. 1, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 14, 25.
§ 1 Cor. vii. 9.
‖ 1 Tim iii. 2, 3, 4.
¶ 1 Cor. ix. 9, 5.

demn the priests that marry; but will they not condemn the Apostles; for Peter and Philip had children, and the latter had his daughters married*.' The ministers of the reformed religion follow this principle, and the example of the Apostles; they are, like them, fathers of families, patterns to their flock; they live in simplicity, making no vows contrary to human nature, the precepts of Scripture, purity of manners, and good order of society.

"I have embraced their communion, because in it there is no prostration before wood or stone, or old relics of corpses to which corruption has paid no respect.

"I have embraced this communion, because in it every thing is referred immediately to God, the Saviour of men, and not to creatures sinful like ourselves; for, saith St. Paul, 'There is but one God, and one Mediator between God and men, the man Christ Jesus†.' And St. John, 'If any man sin, we have an advocate with the Father, Jesus Christ who is righteous‡.' And, consequently, Jesus Christ being here the only hope of believers, they are entirely and uniformly Christians.

"I have embraced this communion, because it does not enjoin upon believers to exhibit their piety in the pomp of streets and public places,—a practice which Jesus Christ reproves, saying, 'Be not like the hypocrites, who affect to pray standing apart in the synagogues, and at the corners of the streets, in order to be seen of men. Verily I say unto you, they have received their reward; but you, when you pray, enter into your closet, and the door being shut, pray unto your Father in secret, and your Father who seeth that which passeth in secret, will give you its reward. When you fast, be not sad like the hypocrites, for they affect to appear with a disfigured countenance, in order that men may know when they fast. Verily, I say unto you, they have their reward. But you, when you fast, anoint your head, and wash your face, that it may not appear unto men that you fast, but to your Father, who is present in the most secret place; and your Father who seeth that which passeth in secret, will give you its reward§.'

---

* John i. 2.
† 1 Tim. ii. 5.
‡ 1 John ii. 1.
§ Matt. vi. 5, 6, 16, 17, 1.

"I have embraced this communion, because in it there is no assumption that he is a better man who eats of fish than he who eats of beef; for I can never believe that it was the design of God, in creating an aliment always wholesome, to prohibit us from using it at certain periods, unless we purchase exemption. Jesus Christ speaks not thus in the following words: 'It is not that which enters into the mouth which defiles the man; but it is that which comes out of the mouth which defiles him*.' And St. Paul says, 'Eat of all that is sold in the shambles, without asking whence it comes, for any scruple of conscience; for the earth is the Lord's, and all that therein is†.'

"I have embraced this communion, because in its public service every thing is understood and comprehended by every individual: and having never learned Latin, I cannot believe it to be the will of God that ministers should edify me in Latin. The custom is condemned by St. Paul, 'Also, my brethren, if I should come unto you speaking in unknown tongues, what usefulness should I bring unto you? I would rather speak in the church five words which I could understand, and which should instruct others, than repeat ten thousand in an unknown tongue‡.' Pope John VIII. was as much a Protestant as myself in this respect, for he said, 'Let the praises of God be sung in the native language;' and I really think, that if what is said to us is good, useful and edifying, it ought to be understood: and if, on the contrary, it is something bad, it ought not to be said, either in Latin, Greek, or Chinese.

"I have embraced this communion, because it does not exclude from future happiness poor little children, on account of their parents' neglect in not having them baptized before their death. This doctrine has always appeared to me absurd, unjust, insulting to the Divinity, and unauthorised by a single word of Scripture.

"I have embraced this communion, because in it the Lord's Supper is a wholly spiritual ceremony, reminding us of the benefits which the Saviour came to confer upon humanity,

* Matt. xv. 11. † 1 Cor. x. 26.
‡ 1 Cor. xiv. 6, 19; read all the chapter.

—a memorial of his death, in which the bread and wine represent only the body and blood of Jesus; for I never could allow that a God wholly spiritual, the Creator of the heavens and the earth,—that God whose nature alone is infinity, could be swallowed like a pill. It has ever appeared to me, that the idea which materialized the Creator was an insult offered by us to Him, as it is an insult to reason itself.

"Lastly, I have embraced the Christian reformed communion, I have embraced it with faith, confidence, and happiness, because it is not supported by the sword of the executioner, it does not place the scaffolds and tortures of the Inquisition beside the cross of Him who came not to destroy men, but to save them. I acknowledge that the violence with which some of its early members may have been reproached, arose from the remains of human prejudice, from a habit of domination and of double power, from which those men could not at once free themselves; but at the present day this church is mild and charitable; it needs not the *Torquemada* to support it; it would not receive such aid; its precept is the precept of the Saviour: 'You shall love the Lord your God with all your heart, and with all your soul, and with all your mind; this is the greatest and first commandment; and this is the second, which is like unto it: You shall love your neighbours as yourselves. In these two commandments are contained all the law and the prophets *.'

"In this communion I recognize the true church of Jesus Christ; that primitive church which was restored by the Gospel, restored at the time of the Reformation. I bless God for having given me thus to distinguish his divine light; my children will one day bless me for having acted the part of an honest man, which is to embrace the truth as soon as he perceives it, without disquieting himself by the menaces and calumnies of those who shun the light, because their deeds are evil. If the step I have taken were yet to take, the pictures of tortures and of scaffolds would be vainly presented in order to stop me; truth is my motto, the approbation of God and my conscience is my law. Numbers are deterred from imitating me by their indifference to the truth and

* Matt. xxii. 37, 38, 39, 40.

religion, and because they fear rather to be blamed in this world, than to be condemned in the other.

"Such, Sir, are the motives which have actuated me. I believe you have a firm and upright mind, and I feel assured of your approbation.

"Accept these sentiments, with which I remain, Sir,

"Your very humble and devoted Servant,

"MOLLARD LEFEVRE."

THE END.

LONDON:
PRINTED BY WILLIAM CLOWES,
Stamford-street.

DATE DUE

APR 0 8 2000

Demco, Inc. 38-293

Princeton Theological Seminary-Speer Library
1 1012 01011 3084